



MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE ON THE
PROTECTION OF FORESTS IN EUROPE

LIAISON UNIT VIENNA

MCPFE Paper 1, May 2001

THE MCPFE AND THE IPF/IFF PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

PDF version

Published by
Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe
Liaison Unit Vienna
Marxergasse 2, A-1030 Vienna, Austria
Tel: +43 1 710 77 02, Fax: +43 1 710 77 02 13
E-mail: liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at <http://www.minconf-forests.net>

© by the publisher, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
I Background information.....	3
1 Global framework	3
2 Nature of IPF/IFF proposals	3
II Assessment.....	4
1 Objective of the assessment.....	4
2 Procedure.....	4
3 Analysis and results.....	4
3.1 Relation of MCPFE and its work to IPF/IFF.....	4
3.2 Linkages to IPF proposals for action	5
3.3 Description of linkages between IPF proposals for action and MCPFE	8
3.4 Linkages to IFF proposals for action	12
3.5 Description of linkages between IFF proposals for action and the MCPFE	15
III Summary and conclusions.....	19
Annexes: Detailed assessment of the relation and linkages between the work of the MCPFE and the IPF/IFF proposals for action.....	20
Annex 1: IPF proposals for action.....	23
Annex 2: IFF proposals for action.....	70

INTRODUCTION

The assessment of the relation between the work of the MCPFE and the IPF/IFF proposals for action was carried out in autumn 2000. Its aim is to make visible linkages of MCPFE work to the proposals for action agreed upon by IPF and IFF. The results of the assessment were presented at the Third Expert Level Meeting of the MCPFE (25-26 September 2000, Vienna/Austria).

The potential use of the assessment can be twofold. On the one hand, it provides a useful tool for action at the national level in European countries in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action. On the other hand, it could also facilitate the global dialogue on forests by pointing out those areas which have been successfully addressed at the regional level in Europe and in which the MCPFE could contribute by introducing expertise and experiences.

For purposes of this publication, the assessment has been up-dated, reflecting the state of linkages as identified in May 2001.

I BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1 Global framework

The International Arrangement on Forests recommended by the IFF at its fourth session and endorsed by the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) at its eighth session in May 2000 will perform six functions in order to achieve its objective. Principle function (a) of the International Arrangement is to "*facilitate and promote the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action as well as other actions, which may be agreed upon, including through national forest programmes and other integrated programmes relevant to forests; catalyse, mobilise, and generate financial resources; and mobilise 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 co-operation.*" Thus, the International Arrangement underlines the relevance of enhanced efforts in the implementation of the IPF and IFF proposals for action in order to progress towards the objective of sustainable management, conservation and sustainable development of forests.

2 Nature of IPF/IFF proposals

The more than 280 proposals for action identified by IPF and IFF aim to promote multidisciplinary action consistent with the Forest Principles and Agenda 21, Chapter 11. They are meant to complement, supplement and elaborate upon these UNCED decisions in a holistic and comprehensive way. Like the Forest Principles and Agenda 21, the IPF Proposals are of a non-legally binding nature.

The proposals address a broad range of issues, and they are characterised by numerous thematic inter-linkages and overlaps. They include measures to be taken at national, regional and international levels. Although most of the proposals are of particular relevance for action at the national level, they are characterised by linkages to the international forest regime which need to be taken into consideration when implementing them.

II ASSESSMENT

1 Objective of the assessment

The assessment of the relation between the MCPFE Work Programme and the IPF/IFF proposals for action aims to make visible the linkages between MCPFE activities and the proposals. The assessment reveals those thematic areas which were identified as priority issues both by IPF/IFF and by the MCPFE, and – as a natural result – also points towards those areas which have not been taken up at the pan-European level so far. Furthermore, it visualises the degree in which the MCPFE contributes to the implementation of the respective proposals for action.

2 Procedure

The assessment was carried out by systematically screening all IPF and IFF proposal for action and by examining linkages between each individual proposal for action and the elements of the MCPFE Work Programme.

3 Analysis and results

In the following, the results of the assessment of the relation between the MCPFE Work Programme and the IPF/IFF proposals for action are summarised. The detailed analysis of the assessment - indicating linkages between each individual IPF and IFF proposal for action and the elements of the MCPFE Work Programme – is included in the Annexes to this background paper ("Annexes: Detailed assessment of the relation and linkages between the work of the MCPFE and the IPF/IFF proposals for action").

3.1 Relation of MCPFE and its work to IPF/IFF

The relation between the global forest policy dialogue and the MCPFE in general can be described as a mutually supportive and stimulating process, aimed at the overall objective of the sustainable management, conservation and sustainable development of forests. The discussion and decisions taken at the global level have been continuously taken up and further developed in the pan-European context, and - through its signatory countries - the MCPFE has also contributed to the deliberations of IPF and IFF.

The inter-linkage between the global policy dialogue and the MCPFE is accordingly also reflected in the relation of the work of the MCPFE to the more than 280 IPF/IFF proposals for action. The assessment of the proposals for action indicated that the MCPFE contributes to a number of priority issues addressed under programme elements of the IPF and IFF programmes of work. In some case, as e.g. with regard to National Forest Programmes, the IPF/IFF proposals for action constitute the explicit reference for the work of the MCPFE. The assessment also underlines the significance of the MCPFE as a regional platform for further prioritisation and enhanced co-ordination, thus providing an effective linkage between the global and national levels.

However, the assessment also reveals several thematic areas addressed at the global level that are only partially or not at all dealt with by the MCPFE. In part, this clearly underlines the specificity of the MCPFE as a regional platform for the particular European conditions. Obviously, not all of the issues addressed under IPF and IFF programme elements are of the same relevance in the particular pan-European context as they are at the global level.

3.2 Linkages to IPF proposals for action

The IPF proposals for action, which were endorsed by UNGASS in June 1997, cover five broad categories:

- I. Implementation of United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) decisions related to forests at the national and international levels, including an examination of sectoral and cross-sectoral linkages (Programme element I);
- II. International cooperation in financial assistance and technology transfer (Programme element II);
- III. Scientific research, forest assessment, and development of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management (Programme element III);
- IV. Trade and environment in relation to forest products and services (Programme element IV);
- V. International organizations and multilateral institutions, and instruments, including appropriate legal mechanisms (Programme element V).

The assessment of the relation between the proposals for action attached to these categories and the work of the MCPFE reveals considerable variations with regard to those areas where linkages have been established and those ones where no or only few linkages could be observed.

An overview of the linkages established between the IPF proposals for action and the elements of the MCPFE Work Programme is given in Table 1. The table also indicates the degree of these linkages, using the following classification: "strong", "considerable", "weak/no linkage".

Table 1: IPF proposals for action – overview of linkages to MCPFE Work Programme

Element ("Category")	Sub-element	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme Element	Degree of Linkage		
			Strong	Considerable	Weak/ no linkage
I. Implementation of UNCED decisions related to forests at the national and international levels, including an examination of sectoral and cross-sectoral linkages	A. Progress through national forest and land-use programmes	WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes WP Element 1.2 – Public Participation	X		
	B. Underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation	Strasbourg Resolutions S1 – S6 Helsinki Resolutions H1, H2 WP Element 1.1 – Public Relations		X	
	C. Traditional forest-related knowledge	WP Element 1.2 – Public Participation WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes			X
	D. Fragile ecosystems affected by desertification and drought	WP Element 3.1 – Biological and Landscape Diversity WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes		X	
	E. Impact of airborne pollution on forests	Strasbourg Resolutions S1, S2, S5, S6 WP Element 4.2 – Criteria and Indicators for SFM	X		
	F. Needs and requirements of developing and other countries with low forest cover	WP Element 1.2 – Public Participation WP Element 2.2 – Renewable Resources – Goods and Services WP Element 2.4 – Countries in Transition WP Element 3.1 – Biological and Landscape Diversity WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes Lisbon Resolution L2		X	

Element ("Category")	Sub-element	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme Element	Degree of linkage		
			Strong	Considerable	Weak/no linkage
II. International co-operation in financial assistance and technology transfer	A. Financial assistance				X
	B. Technology transfer and capacity building and information	WP Element 2.3 – Training, Education and Gender Aspects WP Element 2.4 – Countries in Transition		X	
III. Scientific research, forest assessment, and development of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management	A. Assessment of multiple benefits of forests	WP Element 4.2 – Criteria and Indicators for SFM WP Element 2.1 – Rural Development Lisbon Resolution L2	X		
	B. Forest research	Strasbourg Resolutions S1, S4, S6			X
	C. Methodologies for proper valuation of multiple benefits of forests	WP Element 2.2 – Renewable Resources – Goods and Services Lisbon Resolution L1		X	
	D. Criteria and Indicators for SFM	WP Element 4.2 – Criteria and Indicators for SFM Lisbon Resolution L2	X		
IV. Trade and environment in relation to forest products and services		WP Element 2.2 – Renewable Resources – Goods and Services			X
V. International organisations and multilateral institutions, and instruments, including appropriate legal mechanisms		Lisbon General Declaration			X

3.3 Description of linkages between IPF proposals for action and MCPFE

IPF Category I

The contribution of the MCPFE to the implementation of the proposals for action under Category I covers a broad range of thematic areas, which are as follows:

- A. As re-iterated by the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), National Forest Programmes (NFPs) provide an integrated approach to the implementation of the IPF proposals for action and other forest related conventions and instruments. The MCPFE has taken up the issue of NFPs in its Work Programme and initiated a working process. This working process is aimed to further clarify the meanings and dimensions of elements and principles of NFPs and to determine further steps with a view to the next Ministerial Conference. Through its work, the MCPFE contributes to the implementation of the related IPF proposals for action. In the IPF proposals for action special emphasis is given to the development of appropriate participatory mechanisms. The MCPFE addresses the issue of participation both within its work on NFPs and as a separate element of the Work Programme. Work on this element has been mandated to the Team of Specialists on Participation and Partnership in Forestry under the FAO/ECE/ILO Joint Committee Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry¹.
- B. The MCPFE also puts strong emphasis on effectively meeting the problem of forest degradation and deforestation. Linkages to the IPF proposals for action have been established with regard to studying and analysing underlying causes of forest degradation and with regard to providing information on them. The extensive research and monitoring networks established in the follow-up of the Strasbourg Conference provide in-depth knowledge and necessary data on underlying causes of forest degradation. Timely, reliable and accurate factual information on this work and its findings is broadly made available through regular reporting within the MCPFE and through publications and the world wide web, therefore providing a foundation for public understanding and decision-making.
- C. Linkages to sub-element "traditional forest related knowledge" have only be established by the MCPFE through its work on NPFs. It was mentioned by the participants of the Workshop on the Role of National Forest Programmes in the Pan-European Context that customary and traditional rights and secure land-tenure arrangements relevant elements of NFPs also in the pan-European context.

¹ The Team of Specialists published the working paper "Public Participation in Forestry in Europe and North America" in September 2000 (International Labour Office, WP. 163). The paper, *inter alia*, introduces a working definition and principles for public participation.

- D. One important aspect of safeguarding fragile forest ecosystems affected by desertification and drought that is included in IPF's proposals for action is the establishment of protected areas. Also the MCPFE has identified Protected Forest Areas (PFAs) as one of its priority issues which is dealt with by special working groups under its Work Programme Element "Biodiversity and Conservation". Linkages between the work of the MCPFE and the IPF proposals for action related to fragile forest ecosystems have also been established in the context of NFPs.
- E. A strong linkage could be identified between the IPF proposals for action on impact of airborne pollution on forests and the follow-up work of Strasbourg Resolution S1. In the follow-up to Resolution S1 a broad scientific and technical co-operation was initiated which has succeeded in establishing a broad scientific base on impacts of airborne pollutants on forest ecosystems in Europe and in providing comprehensive information on these impacts. Data obtained e.g. from the European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems is used for reporting on the related quantitative indicators of the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators (C&I) for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM), thus constituting an important basis for political decision making at the national and pan-European levels.
- F. To a certain extent, linkages have also been established between IPF sub-element "needs and requirements of developing and other countries with low forest cover" and the work of the MCPFE on effectively addressing the major concerns and needs of Countries with Economies in Transition (CITs). Both the IPF and the MCPFE put special emphasis on measures enhancing capacity building. Also actions of the MCPFE regarding the development of appropriate policy tools (NFPs; C&I for SFM) and mechanisms (public participation) as well as regarding protected forest areas and wood and substitutes are linked to the IPF proposals for action.

IPF Category II

- A. Questions of international co-operation in financial assistance, as dealt with under IPF's Category II, have not been on the agenda of the MCPFE. Consequently, no linkages between the work of the MCPFE and the respective IPF proposals for action could be identified.
- B. However, the MCPFE contributes to enhanced technology transfer and capacity building and information through actions directed towards enhanced capacity building, notably through the promotion of the development of educational and training programmes and through activities on forestry assistance to CITs. In general, the geographic focus of the MCPFE with regard to technology transfer lies on Central and Eastern European Countries.

IPF Category III

- A. The IPF proposals for action related to the assessment of the multiple benefits of all types of forests notably focus on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management and their integration into national forest assessments. With its work on criteria and indicators the MCPFE has established a strong linkage to the IPF proposals for action, a fact that underlines the significance of the MCPFE in linking the national level to the global one. Through the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management the MCPFE provides a common pan-European reference framework for the development and implementation of national criteria and indicators and for the collection of data and reporting on European Forests at the pan-European level. The inclusion of most of the quantitative pan-European indicators into the Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment 2000 (TBFRA-2000) allows to obtain concise and reliable data on European forest resources and their multiple benefits. At the same time the MCPFE remains fully committed to the further improvement and development of the pan-European indicators in order to be able to better identify and assess the multiple benefits derived from forests.
- B. As the main addressees of the IPF proposals for action on forest research are scientific bodies, bodies established under global conventions as well as international financing institutions, the only linkage between the MCPFE and the proposals relates to the extension of on-site research as done e.g. in the follow-up of Strasbourg Resolutions S1, S4 and S6.
- C. The issue of methodologies for the proper valuation of the multiple benefits of forests is also being addressed by the MCPFE in its work on valuation of goods and services. As part of the MCPFE Work Programme, the Czech Republic convened a seminar on valuation of forest goods and services in November 2000 which notably focused on the valuation of non-marketed goods and services including biodiversity aspects and which discussed positive externalities of forests as well as non-market social services.
- D. As was already stated, a strong linkage could be identified between the IPF proposals for action dealing with criteria and indicators for SFM and the work of the MCPFE on C&I. This includes the provision of the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for SFM as a reference framework for the development of national sets of C&I, their use as a basis for collecting data and reporting on forests as well as their further improvement in co-operation with relevant scientific and technical bodies. In autumn 2000 the MCPFE established an "Advisory Group" to develop proposals for improved indicators by mid 2002. In addition, with the "Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines" the MCPFE has developed a common pan-European tool which translates the international commitments to the operational level of sustainable forest management.

IPF Category IV

A linkage between the work of the MCPFE and the IPF proposals for action related to trade and environment has only been established with regard to certain aspects of the topic. For example, in contributing to the MCPFE Work Programme, UN-ECE has been investigating the competitive climate for wood products and paper packaging and is planning a seminar on strategies to stimulate and promote the sound use of wood and other forest-based products as environmentally friendly and renewable materials in 2001.

Another aspect related to trade and environment is certification of SFM. The work of the MCPFE on this issue focuses on the assessment of the potential impacts of forest certification systems on SFM, according to the commitment made in Lisbon Resolution L1. The task of assessing the impact of SFM certification programmes has been the objective of the EU-FAIR research project "Policy Analysis of Certification of Forest Management as a Policy Instrument to Promote Multifunctional Sustainable Forest Management." The report of this project has been jointly published by the MCPFE and the European Commission the in spring 2000.

IPF Category V

The proposals for action under Category V are directed towards international organisations and institutions and they refer to options for continuation of the intergovernmental policy dialogue. Therefore, these proposals are not related to the work of the MCPFE.

3.4 Linkages to IFF proposals for action

The work of IFF was conducted according to three categories (“programme elements”) which in the course of IFF negotiation process have been “re-structured” as follows:

- A. Promoting and facilitating implementation (programme element I.a)
- B. Monitoring progress in implementation (programme element I.b)
- C. Matters left pending on the need for financial resources (programme element II.a)
- D. Trade and environment (programme element II. b)
- E. Transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management (programme element II.c)
- F. Issues that need further clarification (programme element II.d)
 - 1. Underlying causes of deforestation (programme element II.d (i))
 - 2. Traditional forest-related knowledge (programme element II.d (ii))
 - 3. Forest conservation and protected areas (programme element II.d (iii))
 - 4. Forest research (programme element II.d (iv))
 - 5. Valuation of forest goods and services (programme element II.d (v))
 - 6. Economic instruments, tax policies and land tenure (programme element II.d (vi))
 - 7. Future supply of and demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services (programme element II.d (vii))
 - 8. Assessment, monitoring and rehabilitation of forest cover in environmentally critical areas (programme element II.d (viii))
- G. Forest-related work of international and regional organizations and under existing instruments (programme element II.e)

Also for each of these IFF programme elements and sub-elements a number of proposals for action were agreed upon. In terms of contents, the IFF proposals for action aim to reinforce and complement the IPF proposals and – in some areas – extend the scope of what had been agreed upon by the IPF.

Table 2 gives an overview of the linkages between the IFF proposals for action and the elements of the MCPFE Work Programme and indicates the degree of these linkages.

Table 2: IFF proposals for action – overview of linkages to MCPFE Work Programme

Element	Sub-element	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme Elements	Degree of linkage		
			Strong	Considerable	Weak/ no linkage
A. Promoting and facilitating implementation (programme element I.a)		Lisbon General Declaration WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes WP Element 2.4 – Countries in Transition	X		
B. Monitoring progress in implementation (programme element I.b)		Lisbon Resolution L2 WP Element 4.2 – Criteria and Indicators for SFM		X	
C. Matters left pending on the need for financial resources (programme element II.a)					X
D. Trade and environment (programme element II.b)		WP Element 2.2 – Renewable Resources – Goods and Services			X
E. Transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support SFM (programme element II.c)		WP Element 2.2 – Renewable Resources – Goods and Services WP Element 2.3 – Training, Education and Gender Aspects WP Element 2.4 – Countries in Transition		X	
F. Issues that need further clarification (programme element II.d)	1. Underlying causes of deforestation (programme element II.d (i))	WP Element 1.2 – Public Participation WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes Lisbon Resolution L2 Strasbourg Resolutions S1, S3, S6		X	
	2. Traditional forest-related knowledge (programme element II.d (ii))				X

Element	Sub-element	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme Elements	Degree of linkage		
			Strong	Considerable	Weak/ no linkage
	3. Forest conservation and protected areas (programme element II.d (iii))	WP Element 3.1 – Biological and Landscape Diversity WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes Helsinki Resolutions H1, H2 Lisbon General Declaration – WP-CEBLDF Lisbon Resolution L2		X	
	4. Forest research (programme element II.d (iv))	Strasbourg Resolutions S1, S3, S6 Helsinki Resolution H3 Lisbon Resolution L2			X
	5. Valuation of forest goods and services (programme element II.d (v))	WP Element 2.2 – Renewable Resources – Goods and Services WP Element 4.2 – Criteria and Indicators for SFM		X	
	6. Economic instruments, tax policies and land tenure (programme element II.d (vi))	WP Element 2.1 – Rural Development			X
	7. Future supply of and demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services (programme element II.d (vii))	WP Element 2.1 – Rural Development WP Element 2.2 – Renewable Resources – Goods and Services WP Element 4.2 – Criteria and Indicators for SFM		X	
	8. Assessment, monitoring and rehabilitation of forest cover in environmentally critical areas (programme element II.d (viii))	Strasbourg Resolutions S1, S3 Lisbon Resolution L2			X
G. Forest-related work of international and regional organisations and under existing instruments (programme element II.e)	Lisbon General Declaration Lisbon Resolution L2 WP Element 1.1 – Public Relations WP Element 2.4 – Countries in Transition WP Element 4.1 – National Forest Programmes		X		

3.5 Description of linkages between IFF proposals for action and the MCPFE

IFF Programme element I.a

The proposals for action under programme element I.a "Promoting and facilitating implementation" confirm the relevance of NFPs as integrated approaches to the implementation of the IPF and IFF proposals for action and put further emphasis on the development of appropriate participatory mechanisms and on co-ordinated, inter-sectoral planning. IFF also encourages further assistance by the international community in implementing these proposals, which in the pan-European context should notably be directed towards CITs. Thus, the significance of the work of the MCPFE on the issue of NFPs and related topics – as e.g. the further work on participation and partnership in forestry and the activities on assistance to CITs – is confirmed.

IFF Programme element I.b

The IFF proposals related to element I.b "Monitoring progress in implementation" focus on the collection and reporting of information on forests/SFM and on the further development and implementation of criteria and indicators for SFM. Both aspects – the further development and improvement of the pan-European indicators as well as further improvement and harmonisation of data collection and pan-European reporting – constitute important elements of the MCPFE Work Programme.

IFF Programme element II.a

As was already stated with regard to the IPF proposals for action, questions related to the provision of financial resources exceed the scope of those issues that have been dealt with at the pan-European level so far. Therefore, no linkage to IFF programme element II.a "Matters left pending on the need for financial resources" could be identified.

IFF Programme element II.b and II.c

The IFF proposals for action on programme elements II.b "Trade and environment" and II.c "Transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management" aim to enhance the effective implementation of the IPF proposals for action on the issue. Therefore, those linkages that had been established between these IPF proposals and the work of the MCPFE also exist with regard to the IFF proposals.

One particular aspect, which has been included into the IFF proposals for action under programme element II.c and which had not been addressed by the IPF proposals, is to undertake steps to ensure equal opportunities for women with regard to environmentally sound technologies, know-how

and extension services. Also the MCPFE addresses the role of women in forestry, taking a broader view on the issue. In contributing to the MCPFE Work Programme, the seminar "Women in Forestry – Strategies to increase women's participation in the forest sector in Europe and North America" was convened by the Government of Portugal and the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training in co-operation with IUFRO on 2-6 April 2001 in Viseu/Portugal. The seminar explored the actual situation of women in the forestry sector (representation of women in workforce and decision making, opportunities and main obstacles, etc.) and elaborated a number of recommendations for future action.

IFF Programme element II.d

IFF programme element II.d includes several issues most of which had already been addressed by IPF and which – according to IFF – need further clarification.

1. IFF stressed the importance of the IPF proposals for action related to underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation and put further emphasis on certain aspects of the issue. For example, the importance of creating appropriate participatory mechanisms in decision-making about forests was further highlighted by IFF. This issue also constitutes an important element of the MCPFE Work Programme, both as a separate element and in the context of NFPs. Furthermore, the IFF proposals underline the importance of aspects of land tenure and ownership as well as of traditional rights of indigenous people and forest owners. In its work on NFPs the MCPFE also addresses these aspects in the pan-European context. With the "Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management", endorsed by the ministers in Resolution L2, the MCPFE has developed a common pan-European tool which aims to further promote sustainable forest management in Europe by translating the international commitments down to the operational level, thus also responding to central recommendations of the IFF proposals. Finally, the multiple information activities of the MCPFE in the follow-up of the Strasbourg Resolutions contribute to create awareness in the society at large on the importance of issues related to deforestation and forest degradation.
2. With regard to those aspects of traditional forest related knowledge included in the IPF proposals for action on this thematic area, no linkages to the work of the MCPFE could be observed.
3. In its work the MCPFE has established various linkages to IFF sub-element forest conservation and protected areas. In general, the commitment to the conservation, protection and sustainable management of European forests constitutes the central driving force behind the MCPFE process. The common definition of the MCPFE of sustainable forest management, Helsinki Resolution H2 on "General Guidelines for the Conservation of the Biodiversity of European Forests" and the "Work Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000" (WP-CEBLDF) are examples of the particular commitment to the effective protection and conservation of European forests and their biological diversity. This commitment responds to the IFF proposals for action, some of which

are formulated in a rather general way. However, the MCPFE has also established linkages to several of the more detailed proposals for action. For example, the IFF proposals for action constitute the reference for the work of the MCPFE on the definition of criteria for setting priorities for forest conservation (Action 2.1 of the WP-CEBLDF). One important aspect of the work of the MCPFE on the issue biological and landscape diversity is the elaboration of a pan-European approach to definitions and classifications of Protected Forest Areas (PFAs), which is also one of the central stipulations of the IFF proposals for action.

4. The IFF proposals for action on forest research mostly focus on actions to be carried out at the national level or by ITFF member organisations, and many of the proposals are related to questions of funding and financing. However, the MCPFE contributes to one certain aspect mentioned in the proposals in various ways, namely to enhancing access to forest-related information by all interested parties. Data collected on most of the quantitative pan-European indicators in the frame of the TBFRA-2000, the database on assistance to CITs established in the follow-up of Helsinki Resolution H3 and the multitude of information collected in the follow-up of the Strasbourg Resolutions which are all made broadly available on the internet and through the reporting activities of the MCPFE, can be mentioned as examples for the provision and distribution of forest-related information by the MCPFE.
5. In its work on valuation of forest goods and services derived from forests the MCPFE focuses on a range of open questions related, thus supporting the development of approaches for valuation as encouraged by IFF. Furthermore, the efforts of the MCPFE in improving the pan-European indicators for SFM also aim to improve collection of quantitative data on the range of forest goods and services, as urged in the proposals.
6. A linkage between the work of the MCPFE and the IPF proposals for action related to economic instruments, tax policies and land tenure can loosely be seen with regard to the relation of the forest sector to other sectors in the context of rural development.
7. With its work on rural development, the valuation of forest goods and services and on wood and substitutes the MCPFE also contributes to various aspects identified by IFF with regard to future supply of and demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services. In addition, the further development of indicators also includes measuring non-wood products derived from forests.
8. By periodically reporting on the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for SFM and through the collaborative activities initiated as a result of the Strasbourg Conference the MCPFE contributes to enhanced co-operation and co-ordination of activities concerning forests in environmentally critical areas and to the systematic collection, analysis and dissemination of information, including social and economic data.

IFF Programme element II.e

The proposals for action under programme element II.e aim to encourage participation and achieve support of interested parties, including international and regional organisations and instruments, in implementing the IFF proposals for action and to foster synergies between these organisations and instruments. The ministers responsible for forests in Europe clearly expressed their commitment to "take national as well as co-operative actions towards the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS) concerning the proposals for action agreed at the ad-hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and contributing to the work of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests under the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD/IFF)" at the Third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe.

III SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The more than 280 proposals for action reflect the consensus achieved under the IPF and the IFF on the commitment of governments to the sustainable management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests.

The MCPFE in its work addresses a number of priority issues covered by the proposals for action and plays an important role as a regional platform for enhanced co-ordination between the global and national levels. The assessment visualises several strong linkages between the MCPFE Work Programme and the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and in some areas the IPF/IFF proposals for action constitute the explicit reference for work of the MCPFE. Important thematic areas of the work of the MCPFE that are strongly linked to the proposals for action are National Forest Programmes; Criteria and Indicators for SFM as well as impacts of airborne pollution on forests.

Linkages of a considerable degree have also been established with a number of other issues, including conservation and protected areas; deforestation and forest degradation; fragile ecosystems; needs and requirements of Countries with Economies in Transition as well as transfer of technologies to support SFM; wood and non-wood forest goods and services, including valuation, the relation to substitutes and the role of these products in rural development.

However, the assessment also reveals several thematic areas addressed at the global level that are only partially or not at all dealt with by the MCPFE. For example, issues related to international co-operation in financial assistance, trade and environment, traditional forest related knowledge and economic instruments as well as tax policies have not been considered in the work of the MCPFE. With regard to these areas it could in particular be assessed if the MCPFE could contribute to enhance synergies with national policy processes and to improve coherence between the global and the national levels.

ANNEXES

Detailed Assessment of the Relation and Linkages Between the Work of the MCPFE and the IPF/IFF Proposals for Action

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Annex 1: IPF proposals for action.....	23
I. Implementation of UNCED decisions related to forests at the national and international levels, including an examination of sectoral and cross-sectoral linkages.....	23
A. Progress through national forest and land-use programmes (§ 17)	23
B. Underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation (§§ 27-31)	27
C. Traditional forest-related knowledge (§ 40).....	32
D. Fragile ecosystems affected by desertification and drought (§ 46).....	37
E. Impact of airborne pollution on forests (§ 50).....	39
F. Needs and requirements of developing and other countries with low forest cover (§ 58)	41
II. International co-operation in financial assistance and technology transfer	44
A. Financial assistance (§§ 67-71).....	44
B. Technology transfer and capacity building and information (§§ 77-78)	48
III. Scientific research, forest assessment and the development of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management.....	52
A. Assessment of the multiple benefits of all types of forests (§ 89).....	52
B. Forest research (§ 94)	55
C. Methodologies for the proper valuation of the multiple benefits of forests (§ 104).....	56
D. Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management (§ 115)	57
IV. Trade and environment in relation to forest products and services.....	60
V. International organisations and multilateral institutions and instruments, including appropriate legal mechanisms.....	67

Annex 2: IFF proposals for action	70
I. Promoting and facilitating the implementation of the proposals for action of the Intergovernmental panel on forests, and reviewing, monitoring and reporting on progress in the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests	70
A. Promoting and facilitating implementation (§ 9)	70
B. Monitoring progress in implementation (§§ 16-19).....	74
II. Matters left pending and other issues arising from the programme elements of the intergovernmental panel on forests process.....	77
A. Need for financial resources (§§ 30-31).....	77
B. Trade and environment (§§ 41-42)	79
C. Transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management (§ 56).....	81
D. Issues that need further clarification	87
1. Underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation (§§ 63-67).....	87
2. Traditional forest-related knowledge (§§ 73-75)	91
3. Forest conservation and protected areas (§§ 83-90).....	93
4. Forest research (§§ 95-98)	99
5. Valuation of forest goods and services (§§ 106-107).....	102
6. Economic instruments, tax policies and land tenure (§ 115)	104
7. Future supply of and demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services (§§ 121-122)	106
8. Assessment, monitoring and rehabilitation of forest cover in environmentally critical areas (§§ 128-129)	109
E. Forest-related work of international and regional organizations and under existing instruments (§§ 139-144).....	111

ANNEX 1: IPF PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

I. Implementation of UNCED decisions related to forests at the national and international levels, including an examination of sectoral and cross-sectoral linkages

A. Progress through national forest and land-use programmes (§ 17)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 17)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>17. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Encouraged countries, in accordance with their national sovereignty, specific country conditions and national legislation to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate national forest programmes, which include a wide range of approaches for sustainable forest management taking into consideration the following: consistency with national, sub-national or local policies and strategies and as appropriate international agreements; partnership and participatory mechanisms to involve interested parties; recognition and respect for customary and traditional rights of <i>inter alia</i> indigenous people and local communities; secure land tenure arrangements; holistic, intersectoral and iterative approaches; eco-system approaches, which integrate the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of biological resources; adequate provision and valuation of forest goods and services;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>The IPF Proposals for Action on national forest programmes constitute a reference for the work of the MCPFE on this issue. National Forest Programmes (NFPs) constitute a separate element of the MCPFE Work Programme.</p> <p>As one action of the MCPFE Work Programme, a workshop on “The Role of National Forest Programmes in the Pan-European Context” was convened in September 1999 (action one under Element 4.1 of the MCPFE Work Programme). As a result, it was agreed that the approach and IPF principles and elements regarding NFPs are relevant for Europe, whereas differences in importance might appear.</p> <p>Furthermore, in preparation of the Second MCPFE Workshop on National Forest Programmes in July 2001, meanings and dimensions of the principles and elements of NFPs in the pan-European context were explored by means of a questionnaire.</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 17)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(b) Called for improved cooperation in support of the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests, and urged all countries to use national forest programmes, as appropriate, as a basis for international cooperation in the forest sector;	Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes	By determining common objectives and actions on the issue of NFPs, the MCPFE contributes to improved international co-operation and to the use of NFPs as a basis for this co-operation.
(c) Stressed the need for international cooperation in the adequate provision of ODA, as well as possible new and additional funding from the GEF and other appropriate innovative sources of finance for the effective development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national forest programmes;		
(d) Encouraged countries to integrate suitable criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management as appropriate into the overall process of the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of national forest programmes on a step by step basis;	Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes	The importance of the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management as the basis for the development of monitoring instruments within an iterative NPF process was highlighted by the MCPFE.
(e) Urged countries to develop, test and implement appropriate participatory mechanisms to integrate timely and continuous multidisciplinary research into all stages of the planning cycle;	Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes Work Programme Element 1.2: Public Participation	The MCPFE addresses participation both within its work on further clarification of principles and elements of NFPs and as a separate element of the Work Programme. The work also includes, but is not limited to aspects related to research.

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 17)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(f) Encouraged countries to elaborate systems, including <i>inter alia</i> private and community forest management systems, for planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating national forest programmes that identify and involve where appropriate a broad participation of indigenous people, forest dwellers, forest owners and local communities in meaningful decision-making regarding the management of state forest lands in their proximity, within the context of national laws and legislation;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p> <p>Work Programme Element 1.2: Public Participation</p>	<p>The MCPFE identified appropriate participatory mechanisms involving all interested parties as an essential element of NFPs in the pan-European context. Thus, further clarification of the meanings and dimensions of this element as well as the work of the MCPFE on Work Programme Element “Public Participation” (conceptual framework) contribute to and facilitate the elaboration of systems identifying and involving participation as encouraged in the IPF proposal.</p>
<p>(g) Urged countries, particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, to include capacity building as an objective of national forest programmes, paying particular attention to training, extension services and technology transfer and financial assistance from developed countries taking due account of local, traditional forest related knowledge;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>In the discussion at the Workshop on the Role of NFPs in the Pan-European Context, capacity building was identified as an essential element of NFPs.</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 17)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(h) Encouraged countries to establish sound national coordination mechanisms or strategies among all interested parties, based on consensus building principles, to promote the implementation of national forest programmes;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p> <p>Work Programme Element 1.2: Public Participation</p>	<p>The MCPFE contributes to the establishment of co-ordination mechanisms or strategies by further exploring such co-ordinative structures in the context of NFP elements “decentralisation”, “participation” and “holistic and intersectoral approaches”.</p> <p>Furthermore, also the findings of the FAO/ECE/ILO Joint Committee Team of Specialists on Participation in Forestry provide valuable input. The MCPFE mandated the Team of Specialists, which had been established by the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training, to clarify the concept of participation and to develop a conceptual framework.</p>
<p>(i) Encouraged countries to further develop the concept and practice of partnership, which could include partnership agreements, in the implementation of national forest programmes, as one of the potential approaches for improved coordination and cooperation between all national and international partners.</p>		

B. Underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation (§§ 27-31)

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 27-31)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>27. The Panel urged countries, as relevant and appropriate, with the support of international organizations and the participation of major groups where relevant</p> <p>(a) To prepare in-depth studies of the underlying causes at the national and international levels of deforestation and forest degradation;</p>	<p>Strasbourg Resolutions</p> <p>S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems</p> <p>S2: Conservation of Forest Genetic Resources</p> <p>S3: Decentralised European Data Bank on Forest Fires</p> <p>S4: Adapting the Management of Mountain Forests to New Environmental Conditions</p> <p>S5: Expansion of the Eurosilva Network of Research on Tree Physiology</p> <p>S6: European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems</p>	<p>The resolutions adopted at the First Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (Strasbourg, 1990) initiated a broad technical and scientific co-operation which provides in-depth knowledge and necessary data for common measures for effectively protecting Europe's forests. Past and on-going activities in the follow-up of these Resolutions have notably also been focusing on underlying causes of forest degradation and deforestation at national and regional levels, including ecological, economic and social aspects within the forest sector and in other sectors.</p>
<p>(b) To analyse comprehensively the historical perspective of the causes of deforestation and forest degradation in the world, and other international underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, including transboundary economic forces;</p>	<p>Strasbourg Resolutions</p> <p>S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems</p> <p>S3: Decentralised European Data Bank on Forest Fires</p> <p>S4: Adapting the Management of Mountain Forests to New Environmental Conditions</p> <p>S6: European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems</p>	<p>The historical dimension of the causes of deforestation and forest degradation in Europe is duly being taken into account through permanent monitoring activities in the follow-up of Strasbourg Resolutions S1 and S3. Furthermore, networks of permanent pilot sites will be established in the follow-up of Resolutions S4 and S6.</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 27-31)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(c) To provide new factual information on the significance of transboundary pollution.	Strasbourg Resolutions S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems S2: Conservation of Forest Genetic Resources S4: Adapting the Management of Mountain Forests to New Environmental Conditions S5: Expansion of the Eurosilva Network of Research on Tree Physiology S6: European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems	See comments on proposal § 27(a) above.
28. The Panel urged countries: (a) To assess long term trends in their supply and demand for wood and to consider actions to promote the sustainability of their wood supply and their means for meeting demand, with a special emphasis on investment in sustainable forest management and the strengthening of institutions for forest resource and forest plantations management;		
(b) To recognize and enhance the role of forest plantations as an important element of sustainable forest management complementary to natural forests;		
(c) To support the convening as soon as possible of a global workshop on the international underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation and their relationship to national underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation.		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 27-31)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>29. The Panel also encouraged countries to undertake as needed the following activities:</p> <p>(a) To formulate and implement national strategies, through an open and participatory process, for addressing the underlying causes of deforestation; and if appropriate to define policy goals for national forest cover, as inputs to the implementation of national forest programmes;</p>		
<p>(b) To develop mechanisms, such as environmental impact assessment (EIA), through an open and participatory process, to improve policy formulation and coordination;</p>		
<p>(c) To formulate policies aiming at securing land tenure for local communities and indigenous people, including policies as appropriate aimed at the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of forests.</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 27-31)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>30. The Panel also encouraged countries and inter-national organizations:</p> <p>(a) To provide timely, reliable and accurate information on the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation where needed, as well as on the multiple roles of forests, as a foundation for public understanding and decision-making;</p>	<p>Strasbourg Resolutions, notably S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems S3: Decentralised European Data Bank on Forest Fires S6: European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems</p> <p>Helsinki Resolutions, notably: H1: General Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Europe H2: General Guidelines for the Conservation of the Biodiversity of European Forests</p> <p>MCPFE Work Programme, notably Element 1.1: Public Relations</p>	<p>Information on the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation is provided through multiple reporting, publishing and public awareness activities in the follow-up of the Strasbourg Resolutions. For example, results of the monitoring activities carried out in the follow-up of Strasbourg Resolution S1 are published annually by UN/ECE and the European Commission. Furthermore, a decentralised database containing Forest Fire Statistics (S3) and on research into forest ecosystems (containing 1,198 institutions, scientists and projects) have been established in the internet.</p> <p>In addition, the MCPFE contributes to providing information on the multiple roles of forests through its manifold reporting (e.g. on the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for SFM) and public relations activities (including a broad range of publications and the MCPFE internet web-sites).</p>
<p>(b) To assist developing countries to promote an integrated approach towards the formulation and application of national policy frameworks and in conducting strategic analyses of relevant political, legal and institutional policies that have contributed to deforestation and forest degradation as well as of those that have had a positive effect.</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 27-31)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>31. The Panel,</p> <p>(a) Encouraged countries to undertake case studies using the "diagnostic framework" described above in order to:</p> <p>(i) Identify underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation;</p> <p>(ii) Develop and test the usefulness of the framework as an analytical tool in assessing options for utilization of forest and forest lands;</p> <p>(iii) Refine it, disseminate the results and apply it more widely as appropriate;</p>		
<p>(b) Urged developed countries, UNDP and other multilateral and international organizations, including regional development banks, to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition in these activities;</p>		
<p>(c) Invited interested parties to lend support as appropriate to the preparation of the programme of work for forest biological diversity of the Convention on Biological Diversity, with respect to analysing measures for mitigating the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, as stated in Decision III/12 adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.</p>		

C. Traditional forest-related knowledge (§ 40)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 40)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>40. Recognizing that indigenous people and those forest dependent people who possess TRFK, and hence could play an important role in sustainable forest management, the Panel:</p> <p>(a) Taking into account the decisions arising from the Third meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in particular those related to the implementation of article 8 (j), invited governments, international agencies, research institutions, representatives of indigenous people and those forest dependent people who possess TFRK, and non-governmental organisations to promote activities aimed at advancing international understanding on the role of TFRK in the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests that complement those undertaken by the CBD;</p>		
<p>(b) Invited countries and relevant international organisations, especially the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity to collaborate with indigenous people and those forest dependent people who possess TFRK to promote an internationally acceptable understanding of TFRK and to identify, respect, preserve and maintain TRFK, including innovations and practices that are relevant for the conservation of forest biological diversity and the sustainable use of forest biological resources;</p>		
<p>(c) Invited countries to explore further at appropriate levels different options for policy, institutional and legal frameworks required to support the application of intellectual property rights and/or other protection regimes to TFRK, the fair and equitable sharing of its benefits, and the possible development of formal agreements by which TFRK can be accessed;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 40)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Urged countries, in implementing their forest programmes, to take measures to rehabilitate and protect TFRK, taking into account that an essential condition for the effective protection and rehabilitation of TFRK is the integrity and cultural survival of forest dependent people;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>The participants of the first MCPFE workshop on “The Role of National Forest Programmes in the Pan-European Context” <i>inter alia</i> identified customary and traditional rights and secure land-tenure arrangements as relevant elements of NFPs in the pan-European context.</p>
<p>(e) Called on countries in the context of their national legal systems to promote and provide opportunities for the participation, <i>inter alia</i>, of indigenous people and those forest dependent people who possess TFRK and forest owners in the planning, development and implementation of national forest policies and programmes taking into account principles 2(d) and 5(a) of the Forest Principles;</p>		
<p>(f) Called on countries, with the full support of relevant international organisations, to work with all interested parties to bring together knowledge and experience of the approaches that work in practice, including credit, rewards and the recognition of the fair and equitable sharing of benefits and where appropriate the preparation of technical guidelines on TFRK application;</p>		
<p>(g) Called on countries, with the assistance of international organizations where appropriate, to support national, regional and international efforts that will enhance the capacity of indigenous people and those forest dependent people who possess TFRK and appropriate forest owners to participate, <i>inter alia</i>, in agreements that apply TFRK for sustainable forest management, and to promote partnerships among all interested parties;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 40)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(h) Encouraged countries to recognize and support traditional resource use systems incorporating TFRK including, where appropriate, through the development of new instruments and mechanisms that enhance the security of forest-dependent groups;		
(i) Urged countries to work with communities and build on their knowledge to establish stronger linkages between traditional and emerging national sustainable forest management systems;		
(j) Encouraged countries and relevant international organisations to identify ways to inventory, store, catalogue and retrieve TFRK and to support its effective protection and application, including developing local and indigenous capacity, and to examine opportunities to apply TFRK relating to the management of particular types of forests to other similar forest ecosystems, doing so only with the free and informed consent of the holders of TFRK. The Panel also encouraged countries and international organisations to work out a methodological framework of compatibility between TFRK and new technologies;		
(k) Urged countries with the support of international organizations, to promote research on TFRK in regional and national institutions, with the full involvement of the holders of that knowledge, to maintain and enhance the capacity of such institutions, and to advance the wider understanding and use of the knowledge gained;		

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 40)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(l) Urged countries, national institutions and academic centres to incorporate TFRK in forest management training as a way to sensitize forest managers to the importance of respect for and protection of TFRK; to the need to observe the principle of fair and equitable sharing of benefits; and to the advantages of using it and the disadvantages of ignoring it. They should also emphasize the importance of recognizing TFRK in developing national criteria and indicators for the sustainable management of forests within the context of national forest programmes, and where appropriate in forest management certification schemes;</p>		
<p>(m) Invited countries with the support of donors and international organizations to assist financially and otherwise existing networks promoting the sharing of TFRK on mutually agreed terms, as well as of technology and profits arising from the use of such knowledge among concerned groups and institutions in collaboration with all involved parties including inter alia indigenous people and those forest dependent people who possess TFRK;</p>		
<p>(n) Encouraged countries in collaboration with indigenous people and those forest dependent people who possess TFRK to promote digital mapping (using geographic information systems and geographic position systems), combined, where appropriate, with social mapping for assisting with the establishment of forest holdings, assisting planning and management partnerships; and assisting in the location and storage of cultural and geographical information required to support the management, protection and use of TFRK;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 40)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(o) Invited WIPO together with UNCTAD, taking into account the decision III/14 of the Third Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), to undertake a study aimed at advancing international understanding of the relationship between intellectual property and TFRK and to develop ways and means to promote effective protection of TFRK, in particular against illegal international trafficking, and also to promote the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from such knowledge;</p>		
<p>(p) Encouraged countries to undertake additional pilot studies on the relationship between IPR systems and TFRK, at the national level, in accordance with the decision of the Third meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity;</p>		
<p>(q) Requested the Secretary-General in collaboration with the Convention on Biological Diversity to produce a compilation of international instruments and national legislation, including draft legislation, pertaining to the protection and use of TFRK, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from such knowledge, and encouraged countries to exchange information on national experiences in this field;</p>		
<p>® Urged countries to consider developing mechanisms, subject to national legislation, to ensure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits, including payments where appropriate, with local and indigenous communities from the use of traditional technologies developed by them for sustainable forest management.</p>		

D. Fragile ecosystems affected by desertification and drought (§ 46)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 46)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>46. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Urged countries and international organizations to undertake national and international action to address the complex issues related to dry-land forest ecosystems in countries affected by desertification and drought, <i>inter alia</i>, by adopting an integrated approach to the development and implementation of national forest and/or dryland programmes and other forest and/or dryland policies and by coordinating action, where appropriate, at the regional level;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>Through its work on NFPs the MCPFE contributes to and facilitates the adoption of integrated approaches to the development and implementation of national forest programmes.</p>
<p>(b) Called on countries to continue to analyse past experiences and to monitor trends in forests and related ecosystems affected by desertification and drought, including biophysical, ecological, economic, social, land tenure and institutional factors;</p>		
<p>(c) Urged countries to establish protected areas to safeguard forest and related ecosystems, their water supplies and historical and traditional uses in appropriate localities in areas affected by drought, particularly in arid, semi-arid and dry sub humid regions;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 3.1: Biological and Landscape Diversity</p>	<p>In the work of the MCPFE following the Lisbon Conference protected forest areas were identified as a priority issue. This work on protected forest areas, which is integrated in Objective 2 of the “Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000”, is <i>inter alia</i> based on Helsinki Resolution H2 which states that the signatory states commit themselves to “the establishment of a coherent ecological network of climax, primary and other special forests” at both regional and national levels (H2 §6).</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 46)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Called on countries, donors and international organizations to support education, training, extension systems and participatory research involving indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles in order to develop resource management approaches that will reduce the pressure on forests in fragile ecosystems affected by desertification and drought;</p>		
<p>(e) Urged countries and international organizations to strengthen and further develop partnerships and collaboration between local communities, governments, non-governmental organizations and other major groups in order to promote the sustainable management and regeneration of natural vegetation in ecosystems affected by desertification and drought;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>The MCPFE identified all basic principles and elements of NFPs agreed upon by IPF/IFF, including participation, decentralisation, as well as empowerment of regional and local government structures to be of relevance in the pan-European context. Further clarification of the meanings and dimensions of these element as well as the work of the MCPFE on Work Programme Element “Public Participation” could contribute to implementing the proposal for action.</p>
<p>(f) Urged donors, international agencies and recipient Governments to develop efficient and coordinated programmes of international cooperation and action on forests and related ecosystems affected by desertification and drought, within the context of the Convention to Combat Desertification and the broader mandate of the Panel, the Forest Principles and Agenda 21;</p>		
<p>(g) Invited the Committee on Science and Technology of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention to Combat Desertification to support research on appropriate plant species for use in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid land restoration, on rehabilitation of existing vegetation, on related water management techniques and on the potential for multipurpose trees and the supply of timber and non-timber forest products.</p>		

E. Impact of airborne pollution on forests (§ 50)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 50)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>50. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Encouraged countries to adopt a preventative approach to the reduction of damaging air pollution, which may include long-range transboundary air pollution, in national strategies for sustainable development;</p>		
<p>(b) Encouraged countries to strengthen international cooperation for building scientific knowledge, such as techniques for monitoring and analysing airborne causes of deforestation and forest degradation, and to cooperate in activities related to the impact of air-borne pollution on forest health, including the provision of access to existing data by potential users including managers and policy makers and the dissemination of information to the public;</p>	<p>Strasbourg Resolutions S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems S2: Conservation of Forest Genetic Resources S5: Expansion of the Eurosilva Network of Research on Tree Physiology S6: European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems</p>	<p>The resolutions adopted at the First Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (Strasbourg, 1990) initiated a broad technical and scientific co-operation throughout the European continent which provides in-depth scientific knowledge, including techniques for monitoring and analysis of air-borne causes of deforestation and forest degradation and the impact of air-borne pollution on forest health. The knowledge and data obtained are the basis for political decision making at the national and pan-European levels. Access to existing data is made available to potential users and the public, e.g. by means of regular publications and the internet.</p>
<p>(c) Recommended that existing regional programmes monitoring the impact of air-borne pollution on forest health in affected countries should continue and be extended to other regions where necessary;</p>	<p>Strasbourg Resolution S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems</p>	<p>The European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems covers the whole ECE-Region.</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 50)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Encouraged the development of methods for the assessment and monitoring of national level criteria and indicators for air-borne pollutants in the context of sustainable forest management;</p>	<p>Strasbourg Resolution S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems</p> <p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.1 Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Toward Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems 4.2.3 Pan-European Reporting on SFM</p>	<p>Impacts of airborne pollutants are measured by several pan-European quantitative indicators under Criterion 2 (Maintenance of Forest Ecosystem Health and Vitality) of the pan-European set of C&I. Data on the impacts of airborne pollutants have recently been collected through the Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment 2000 (TBFRA-2000).</p>
<p>(e) Recommended countries to consider entering into international agreements as appropriate on the reduction of long-range transboundary air pollution.</p>		

F. Needs and requirements of developing and other countries with low forest cover (§ 58)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 58)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>58. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Called upon FAO, in consultation with relevant organizations and countries, as appropriate, to develop a workable and precise definition of low forest cover, applicable to all countries, and suitable for use in the Forest Resources Assessment (FRA), 2000;</p>		
<p>(b) Urged countries with low forest cover</p> <p>(i) To seek long-term security of forest goods and services through the development of national forest programmes for sustainable forest management, in accordance with the guiding principles set out in the first section of this chapter, and taking into account the particular conditions of each country, defining as far as possible in those programmes their national requirements for a permanent forest estate (PFE), in those countries that may have a need to define a PFE as a policy goal;</p>		
<p>(ii) To plan and manage forest plantations, where appropriate, to enhance production and provision of goods and services, while paying due attention to relevant social, cultural, economic and environmental considerations in the selection of species, areas and silviculture systems, preferring native species where appropriate, and taking all practicable steps to avoid replacing natural ecosystems of high ecological and cultural values with forest plantations, particularly monocultures;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 58)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(iii) To promote the regeneration and restoration of degraded forest areas, including by involving, <i>inter alia</i> , indigenous people, local communities, forest dwellers and forest owners in their protection and management;		
(iv) To fully analyse and take into account the related social, economic and environmental implications and costs and benefits, when considering non-wood substitutes or imports of forest products;	Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.3: Wood and Substitutes in Relation to Other Sectors	In contribution to the MCPFE Work Programme, FAO/ECE has published a study “The Competitive Climate for Wood Products and Paper Packaging”, and it will convene a seminar on strategies to promote the sound use of wood and other forest-based products as environmentally friendly and renewable materials tentatively in September 2001.
(v) To establish or expand networks of protected areas, buffer zones and ecological corridors, where possible, in order to conserve biodiversity, particularly in unique types of forests, working in close liaison with the parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international environmental agreements;	Work Programme Element 3.1: Biological and Landscape Diversity	In the work of the MCPFE following the Lisbon Conference protected forest areas were identified as a priority issue. This work on protected forest areas, which is integrated in Objective 2 of the “Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000”, is <i>inter alia</i> based on Helsinki Resolution H2 which states that the signatory states commit themselves to “the establishment of a coherent ecological network of climax, primary and other special forests” at both regional and national levels (H2 §6).
(vi) Particularly developing countries and countries with economies in transition, to embark on capacity-building programmes at national and sub-national and local levels, and including especially existing national institutions, to promote effective participation in decision making with respect to forests throughout the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes, and taking full advantage of the wealth of traditional knowledge available in the country;	Work Programme Element 2.4: Countries in Transition Work Programme Element 1.2: Public Participation	In the follow-up of Helsinki Resolution H3 a multitude of bilateral and multilateral actions and projects have been carried out, responding to important needs of Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs), notably also focusing on enhancing capacity and institution building In its Work Programme, the MCPFE has underlined the importance of continuing these activities. As part of the Work Programme, a workshop to facilitate an exchange of information, experiences and major concerns among CEECs will be convened by the government of Poland in co-operation with UN-ECE/FAO and the Liaison Unit Vienna in September 2001 (International workshop “Forests and Forestry in Central and Eastern European Countries – The Transition Process and Challenges Ahead”).

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 58)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(vii) To develop adequate research and information systems, based on reliable evaluations and periodic assessments, including the use of national level criteria and indicators, and establishing sectoral and cross-sectoral mechanisms for information exchange, in order to allow for timely decisions related to national forest policies and programmes;</p>		
<p>(c) Urged developed countries with low forest cover which are nevertheless endowed with suitable land and climate conditions to take positive and transparent action towards reforestation, afforestation and forest conservation, while urging other developed countries, where appropriate, notably those with low forest cover but with limited land and unsuitable climatic conditions, to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition, in particular countries with low forest cover, to expand their forest cover, taking into account principle 8 (a) of the Forest principles, through the provision of financial resources and transfer of appropriate technology as well as the exchange of information and access to technical know-how and knowledge;</p>		
<p>(d) Urged countries and international organizations to improve the efficiency of and procedures for international cooperation to support the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests in developing countries and countries with economies in transition with low forest cover;</p>		
<p>(e) Urged donor countries and multilateral and international organizations to facilitate and assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition with low forest cover, where required, in capacity building for data gathering and analysis so as to enable them to monitor their forest resources;</p>		

II. International co-operation in financial assistance and technology transfer

A. Financial assistance (§§ 67-71)

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 67-71)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p><u>Proposals for action to strengthen financial assistance</u></p>		
<p>67. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Recalled the Rio Declaration and relevant chapters of the Agenda 21 as well as paragraph 10 of the Forest Principles which states that new and additional financial resources should be provided to developing countries to enable them to sustainably manage, conserve and develop their forest resources, including through afforestation, reforestation and combatting deforestation and forest and land degradation;</p>		
<p>(b) Urged recipient countries to prioritize forest activities, or national resources development strategies that would favour sustainable forest management and related activities in programming the ODA available to them, and also urged donor countries and international organizations to increase the proportion and availability of their ODA contribution to programmes supporting management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests in order to respond to increased priorities for sustainable forest management in the recipient countries;</p>		
<p>(c) Requested the relevant United Nations organizations, international financial institutions, other international organizations and the donor community, to work with developing countries, on the basis of national forest programmes, to identify their needs for sustainable forest management, estimate the resources required to finance such needs, and identify the resources available to them for such purposes, including ODA.</p>		
<p>(d) Urged international organizations and international financial institutions to use national forest programmes, as appropriate, as a framework for the support and coordination of forest related activities;</p>		
<p>(e) Encouraged countries, through appropriate channels, to support increased and improved programmes promoting management, conservation and sustainable development of forests and related activities in international organizations and international financial institutions, whose programmes should consider further concessional lending for the forest sector;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 67-71)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(f) Invited UNDP and the Bretton Woods institutions, together with other relevant international organizations, to explore innovative ways both to use existing financial mechanisms more effectively and to generate new and additional public and private financial resources at both domestic and international levels to support activities for management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests;</p>		
<p>(g) Recognised the importance of increasing resources available to developing countries for promoting management, conservation, and sustainable development of all types of forests, welcomed the progress that has been made in devising and implementing debt relief initiatives, and bearing in mind the UNGA Resolution 50/92, urged the international community, particularly the creditor countries and international financial institutions, as well as commercial banks and other lending institutions to continue the implementation of various measures aimed at effective, equitable, development-oriented, and durable solutions to the external debt and debt-servicing problems of developing countries, particularly the poorest and heavily-indebted countries, including exploring the opportunities for innovative mechanisms, such as debt-for-nature swaps related to forests and other environmentally oriented debt reduction programs.</p>		
<p>68. The Panel also discussed the proposal that an international fund be established to support activities for management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests, particularly in developing countries. The following options for action were discussed without reaching consensus on these or other possible procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) to urge the establishment of this fund; (ii) to invite the international community to discuss this proposal; (iii) pursue action to enhance funding in order ways, <i>inter alia</i> as proposed in paragraph 59 (f). 		
<p>Proposals for action to enhance private sector investment</p> <p>69. The Panel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Urged all countries, within their respective legal frameworks, to encourage efforts by the private sector to formulate, in consultation with interested parties, and implement voluntary codes of conduct aimed at promoting sustainable forest management through private sector actions, including through management practices, technology transfer, education and investment; 		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 67-71)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(b) Urged countries to explore mechanisms, within their respective legal frameworks, to encourage their private sector to act consistently with sustainable forest management and to invest financial resources generated from forest-based activities in actions that support sustainable forest management;		
(c) Urged countries to explore mechanisms, within their respective legal frameworks, to encourage reinvestment of revenues generated from forest goods and services back into the forests where those revenues were generated;		
(d) Invited developing countries to promote policies and regulations aimed at creating a favourable environment to attract domestic and foreign private sector, as well as local community investment, for sustainable forest management, environmentally sound forest-based industries, reforestation, afforestation, non-wood forest product industries, and conservation and protection of forests;		
(e) Urged developed countries to formulate and create incentives, such as loan and investment guarantees, to encourage their private sector to invest in sustainable forest management in developing countries as well as in countries with economies in transition.		
<p><u>Proposals for action to enhance national capacity and national coordination</u></p> <p>70. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Urged recipient countries to establish country-driven national forest programmes that include priority needs and that serve as an overall framework for forest related policies and actions including coordination of financing and international cooperation, and urged donor countries and international organisations to support national initiatives aimed at creating national forest programmes and policy framework in developing countries;</p>		
(b) Encouraged countries in a position to do so to continue to develop and employ appropriate market-based and other economic instruments and incentives to increase rent capture and mobilise domestic financial resources in support of sustainable forest management, as well as to reduce social costs and negative environmental impacts due to unsustainable forest and land management practices;		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 67-71)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(c) Encouraged countries, within their respective legal frameworks, international organizations and financial institutions, to enhance subject to national legislation, community financing as an important strategy to promote sustainable forest management and to establish policy and programmatic mechanisms and instruments that facilitate local investments in sustainable forest management by, <i>inter alia</i>, indigenous groups and forest owners;</p>		
<p>(d) Suggested that recipient countries, where appropriate, identify a national authority responsible for in-country coordination in the deployment of financial resources, including ODA, and in requests for external assistance.</p>		
<p>(e) Urged developed countries, international organizations and international financial institutions, to support efforts of developing countries in capacity building in the management, conservation and sustainable development of their forests.</p>		
<p><u>Proposals for action to enhance international cooperation</u></p> <p>71. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Called for enhanced coordination, collaboration and complementarity of activities among bilateral and multilateral donors and among international instruments related to forests, notably the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention to Combat Desertification and the International Tropical Timber Agreement;</p>		
<p>(b) Urged recipient and donor countries, to jointly explore, as a priority activity, appropriate indicators for monitoring and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of forest programmes and projects at the national and local levels supported by international cooperation in financial assistance and technology transfer;</p>		
<p>(c) Encouraged countries to explore the feasibility of innovative financial initiatives, to support the implementation of national forest programmes;</p>		

B. Technology transfer and capacity building and information (§§ 77-78)

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 77-78)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p><u>Proposals for action to enhance technology transfer and capacity-building</u></p> <p>77. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Urged developed countries to promote, facilitate and finance, as appropriate, the access to and the transfer of environmentally sound technologies and corresponding know-how to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed, taking into account Chapter 34 of the Agenda 21 and paragraph 11 of the Forest Principles.</p>		
<p>(b) Encouraged countries, where needed, to assess and identify their national technological requirements and capabilities in order to achieve the management, conservation and sustainable development of their forests. The assessment and identification of specific technology needs should be consistent with priorities in national forest programmes;</p>		
<p>(c) Called for the strengthening of North-South cooperation and the promotion of South-South as well as trilateral North-South-South cooperation in forest related technology transfer through public and private sector investment and partnerships, joint ventures, exchange of information and greater networking among forest related institutions, taking due note of related work being conducted in other international forums, including the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 77-78)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Called upon countries, to formulate policies and incentives that encourage all concerned to develop and use environmentally sound technologies;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.3: Training, Education and Gender Aspects</p>	<p>The activities of the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training contributing to the implementation of Work Programme element “Training, Education and Gender Aspects” provide important information on environmental implications of the use of forest operation technologies and give recommendations for planning and practice.</p>
<p>(e) Called for greater emphasis on national and local capacity-building in the development and implementation of national forest programmes and in international cooperation programmes as well as in the development of mechanisms for the dissemination and adaptation of technologies to national and local conditions;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.3: Training, Education and Gender Aspects</p>	<p>Directed towards forest managers, owners, administrations and associations as well as government agencies the activities of the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training under MCPFE Work Programme Element “Training, Education and Gender Aspects” contribute to national and local capacity building and to international co-operation and the dissemination of technologies in the pan-European region.</p>
<p>(f) Invited governments, within their respective legal frameworks, and international organizations in consultation with countries, to consider supporting indigenous people, local communities, other inhabitants of forests, small-scale forest owners, and forest dependent communities, by funding sustainable forest management projects, capacity building, and information dissemination and by supporting direct participation of all interested parties in forest policy discussions and planning.</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 77-78)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(g) Urged United Nations organizations with the support of the international financial institutions to prepare inventories of the most appropriate forest-related technologies as well as the most effective methods of transfer of these technologies to developing countries among governments, between governments and private sector, and within private sector.</p>		
<p><u>Proposals for action to improve information systems</u></p> <p>78. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Invited relevant international organizations and international financial institutions, to review and initiate the development of improved forest information systems with a view to enhancing coordination and data sharing among interested parties regarding the implementation of national forest programmes, ODA programming, the provision of new and additional financial resources, increased private sector investment, efficient development and transfer of technology.</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.4: Countries in Transition</p> <p>Work Programme Element 2.3: Training, Education and Gender Aspects</p>	<p>By adopting Resolution H3 “Forestry Co-operation with Countries with Economies in Transition” the Ministers <i>inter alia</i> emphasised the importance of co-operation “which may take the form of transfer of knowledge, and of bilateral and multi-lateral project, and should focus on technical, scientific, institutional and legal matters.” The activities of the MCPFE in the follow-up of Resolution H3 have been covering a wide range of forestry issues (including study tours, workshops, training projects, research programmes, technical development, know-how transfer and others), thus also contributing to the implementation of the IPF proposal for action, notably with regard to transfer of information and technology. The international workshop “Forests and Forestry in Central and Eastern European Countries – The Transition Process and Challenges Ahead” that will be convened by Poland in co-operation with UN-ECE/FAO and the MCPFE in September 2001 in Debe/Poland will provide a platform to discuss and exchange information on experiences and major concerns, taking into account the developments of Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs) since the adoption of the resolution in 1993.</p>

III. Scientific research, forest assessment and the development of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management

A. Assessment of the multiple benefits of all types of forests (§ 89)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 89)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>89. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Encouraged countries to integrate national level criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management in national forest assessments including qualitative indicators where appropriate;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>In Resolution L2 the Ministers committed themselves, <i>inter alia</i>, to “promote the development and implementation of national criteria and indicators using the Pan-European criteria and indicators as a reference framework (...)” and to “improve the quality and promote the necessary adaptations of national data collection systems, to fulfil the needs of information for national and international reporting on SFM recognising the need for continuity of terms and definitions.”</p>
<p>(b) Encouraged all countries, where appropriate and step by step, to improve national forest resources assessment, forest statistics and the capacity to analyse and make proper use of forest resources information, and encouraged donor countries and international organizations to support these initiatives;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>See comment on proposal 89 (a) above.</p>
<p>(c) Urged countries, universities and relevant organizations and major groups to strengthen research on forest inventory and monitoring techniques with a view to expanding the scope and improving the quality of forest assessments;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>In Resolution L2 the Ministers also committed themselves to “encourage national and international research institutes to evaluate the consistency, relevance and cost effectiveness of indicators in assessing sustainable forest management, as well as availability of national data. Together with governments and organisations, identify needs, promote and support necessary co-operative research to improve and better assess the multiple functions and uses of forests which are considered as being insufficiently covered by the existing set of criteria and indicators.”</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 89)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Requested FAO, in consultation with Governments and relevant organizations including UNEP, to prepare and distribute a detailed plan for the implementation of FRA 2000. This should provide for the inclusion of a broad range of forest values, including non-timber values, and include detailed cost and funding options associated with potential new parameters, actions, targets and responsibilities for carrying out the assessment consistent with the recommendations of the Kotka III meeting and with due regard to the requirements arising from internationally or regionally agreed criteria and relevant indicators for sustainable forest management;</p>		
<p>(e) Requested FAO to implement the Global Forest Resources Assessment 2000 in collaboration with international organizations, countries and other organizations with competence in assessments, and to share the results of the assessment effectively with the international community;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>Data on most of the quantitative pan-European indicators for SFM have been collected through the Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment 2000 (TBFRA-2000), which forms part of the Global Forest Resource Assessment 2000. The results of the TBFRA-2000 are made available both, as a publication of the UN and in the internet.</p>
<p>(f) Requested FAO, in consultation with countries and relevant international organizations and in an open and transparent manner, to formulate an internationally acceptable set of definitions of key terms used in the assessment of all types of forests and their resources, and to promote their adoption;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Towards Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems</p>	<p>Work of the MCPFE on Criteria and Indicators for SFM also includes to explore possibilities to harmonise forest-related data collection and reporting systems in Europe, which does also include definitions and key terms.</p>
<p>(g) Urged FAO, in partnership with other international organizations, the Intersecretariat Working Group on Forest Statistics, national institutions and NGOs, to address the need for better coordination and avoidance of overlap between forest and other related information systems and for clearer prioritization in data collection;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Towards Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems</p>	<p>See comment on proposal § 89 (f) above</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 89)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(h) Encouraged countries to begin a consultation process with all interested parties at national, sub-national and local levels, to identify the full range of benefits a given society derives from forests, taking the ecosystem approach fully into consideration.</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.1 Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for SFM</p> <p>Work Programme Element 2.1: Rural Development: 2.1.1 Rural Development Concept and Forest Policy in Europe 2.1.2 Contribution of Forests and Forestry to Rural Development in Europe</p>	<p>Further improvement of the pan-European indicators for SFM, which are the basis for the development of national indicators, contributes to better identifying and assessing the multiple benefits derived from forests at national levels.</p> <p>Also work of the MCPFE on the issue of rural development focuses on identifying benefits derived from forests and their significance and potential role in the context of rural development.</p>

B. Forest research (§ 94)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 94)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>94. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Requested the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), in collaboration with relevant organizations and in consultation with a group of internationally recognized experts, as well as in conjunction with national, regional, intergovernmental and non-governmental bodies, to develop as soon as possible mechanisms to:</p> <p>(i) guide the identification and definition as well as prioritization of global and eco-regional interdisciplinary research problems, taking into account national priorities and closely linked to practical and operational forest management issues;</p> <p>(ii) promote consortia or networks to lead and organize global forest research and ensure that results are made available to all users;</p> <p>(iii) build global capacity for forest research and develop new and innovative means to disseminate information and technologies;</p> <p>(iv) mobilize resources to accomplish the above objectives;</p>		
<p>(b) Called on the Conferences of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention to Combat Desertification within their areas of competence, to promote research and analysis undertaken by these Conventions and address gaps in existing knowledge where relevant to their mandate;</p>		
<p>(c) Urged the United Nations system, international financial institutions and countries to examine the need to expand the capacity of existing research institutions at the regional and sub-regional levels and, where appropriate, the establishment of new regional/sub-regional centres for research, development and extension, including for biological diversity and forest products, and other forest goods and services;</p>		
<p>(d) Encouraged countries and regional and international research organizations to extend on-site research and to enhance its prioritization and the application of its results, with the involvement of all interested parties in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of research, so as to enhance its relevance and impact.</p>		

C. Methodologies for the proper valuation of the multiple benefits of forests (§ 104)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 104)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>104. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Encouraged countries, in collaboration with international organizations, to make use of available methodologies to provide improved estimates of the value of all forest goods and services and allow for more informed decision-making about the implications of alternative proposals for forest programmes and land-use plans, taking into account that the wide range of benefits provided by forests are not adequately covered by present valuation methodology, and that economic valuation cannot become a substitute for the process of political decision, which includes consideration of wide-ranging environmental, socio-economic, ethical, cultural and religious concerns;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.1. Valuation of Goods and Services</p>	<p>Given the wealth of both valuation methods and of applications of these methods in practice, the MCPFE in its work on “valuation” notably focuses on the range of open questions related, as e.g. low comparability and political implications. The Czech Republic, in co-operation with the MCPFE, convened an international seminar on the valuation of forest goods and services, including valuation of environmental values, in November 2000.</p>
<p>(b) Requested international organizations and relevant institutions to prepare comprehensive documents on the available forest valuation methods and data-sets required for the evaluation of forest goods and services, in particular those that are not traded in the market place;</p>		
<p>(c) Invited countries and relevant international organizations and institutions to promote research to further develop forest valuation methodologies, in particular those related to deforestation and forest degradation, erosion, and criteria and indicators, taking into account the particular circumstances of each country.</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L1: People, Forests and Forestry – Enhancement of Socio-economic Aspects of Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>In Lisbon Resolution L1 the ministers <i>inter alia</i> committed themselves to “engage further research efforts on socio-economic aspects of sustainable forest management, in particular on the assessment and valuation of the full range of forest goods and services (...)” (Action 9).</p>

D. Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management (§ 115)

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 115)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>115. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Encouraged countries to proceed to prepare, through a participatory approach, national-level criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, and, taking cognizance of specific country conditions and on the basis of internationally and regionally agreed initiatives, to initiate and to implement them, where appropriate, while recognizing that further scientific and technical examination, including field testing, will itself provide valuable experience and assist in further refinement and development;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p> <p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.1 Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for SFM</p>	<p>In Resolution L2 the Ministers <i>inter alia</i> committed themselves to “promote the development and implementation of national criteria and indicators using the pan-European criteria and indicators as a reference framework (...)”.</p> <p>Further improvement of the pan-European indicators for SFM has been initiated in co-operation with relevant scientific and technical bodies. In autumn 2000 the MCPFE established an “Advisory Group” to develop proposals for improved indicators by mid 2002</p>

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 115)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(b) Urged countries to promote, as appropriate, the use of internationally, regionally, sub-regionally and nationally agreed criteria and indicators as a framework for promoting best forest practices and in facilitating sustainable forest management; to encourage the formulation and implementation of criteria and indicators on a cross-sectoral basis and with the full participation of all interested parties; to include them in national forest programmes; to establish and, where appropriate, clarify links between criteria and indicators employed at the national level and at the sub-national or at the forest management unit/operational levels; and to promote their compatibility at all levels;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>The ministerial commitment laid down in Resolution L2 <i>inter alia</i> includes to “promote the development and implementation of national criteria and indicators using the Pan-European criteria and indicators as a reference framework, and taking into account specific country conditions and integrate them into national forest programmes or other relevant policy frameworks.” Furthermore, the ministers committed themselves to “improve the quality and promote the necessary adaptations of national data collection systems, to fulfil the needs of information for national and international reporting on SFM recognising the need for continuity of terms and definitions.” With the “Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management”, endorsed by the ministers in Resolution L2, the MCPFE has also developed a common pan-European tool which translates the international commitments down to the level of forest management planning and practices and which follows the structure of the six pan-European criteria for SFM.</p>
<p>(c) Encouraged countries not yet participating in any of the ongoing international and regional initiatives on criteria and indicators to become involved as soon as possible, thereby gaining benefit from the experience of the existing processes as well as contributing new insights; and urged donor countries, and multilateral and international organizations to provide adequate technical and financial assistance to developing countries and economies in transition to enable them to be involved and to participate in the further development, field testing and implementation of criteria and indicators at the national, sub-national and forest management unit/operational levels;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§ 115)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Urged countries and international organizations, in particular FAO, UNEP and other participants in international and regional initiatives to undertake efforts to achieve a common international understanding on concepts, essential terms and definitions used in formulating and developing criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management and to promote their adoption; on indicators for forests in similar ecological zones; on the mutual recognition among sets of criteria and indicators as tools for assessing trends in forest management and conditions at the national level; and on transparent methods for measurement of indicators and for the collection, assembly, storage and dissemination of data;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>In Lisbon Resolution L2 the European ministers responsible for forests committed themselves to “engage further efforts with other international and regional processes and initiatives, FAO UNEP and other relevant international organisations as well as conventions, to further elaborate common definition of key terms and concepts, as well as methodologies for data collection, storage and dissemination in order to enhance comparability of the different sets of criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management.” (L2 §6)</p>
<p>(e) Recommended that FAO and participants in regional and international initiatives draw on commonalities between criteria and indicators developed in the latter and on the Forest Principles, and recommended that criteria and indicators be used by FAO and other relevant organizations in order to improve consistency on reporting on forest assessment and sustainable forest management;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>Data on most of the quantitative pan-European indicators for SFM has been collected through the Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment 2000 (TBFRA-2000), which forms part of the Global Forest Resource Assessment 2000.</p>
<p>(f) Requested that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity take note of the work of the various existing initiatives on criteria and indicators to ensure that the work done by the Convention on Biological Diversity on developing and implementing biodiversity indicators would be consistent with and complementary to them.</p>		

IV. Trade and environment in relation to forest products and services

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-135)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p><u>Proposals for action on market access</u></p> <p>128. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Urged countries and relevant international organizations to study environmental and social, and economic impacts of trade related measures affecting forest products and services;</p>		
<p>(b) Requested countries to undertake measures for improving market access for forest goods and services, including reduction of tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade in accordance with existing international obligations and commitments, and in this context to promote a mutually supportive relationship between environment and trade in forest goods and services, to avoid conflict between measures which affect trade in forest goods and services and existing international obligations, so that environmental concerns do not lead to disguised barriers to trade;</p>		
<p>(c) Urged all countries, subject to their national legislation, to encourage efforts by the private sector to formulate, in consultation with interested parties, and implement voluntary codes of conduct aimed at promoting sustainable forest management for forest owners, forest developers, and international investors in forestry aimed at improving trade in forest products, and to endeavour to ensure that external trade policies take into account community rights, where appropriate;</p>		
<p>129. The Panel discussed the following options for action relating to possible agreement for forest products from all types of forests, based on non-discriminatory rules and multilaterally agreed procedures, without reaching consensus on these or other possible procedures:</p> <p>(a) to take note of the International Tropical Timber Agreement 1994, and in particular the commitment made by ITTO members to review the scope of this agreement four years after entry into force on 1 January 1997;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-135)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(b) to explore the possibility of extending the concept of the Year 2000 Objective of the ITTA for all types of forests;		
(c) to explore the possibility of an international agreement on trade in forest products from all types of forests;		
(d) to examine the possibilities of further initiatives on trade liberalisation within the auspices of the WTO;		
(e) to explore within an Intergovernmental Forum on Forests, Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee(INC)or other arrangements decided upon at an appropriate time, the possibilities of promoting management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and trade in forest products in the context of an international, comprehensive and legally binding instrument on all types of forests.		
130. The Panel considered the question of relationship between obligation under international agreement and national measures, including those actions imposed by subnational jurisdictions, but was not able to reach consensus. Options for action proposed included: (a) Urging countries to remove all unilateral measures to the extent that these are inconsistent with international agreements;		
(b) Urging countries to remove all unilateral bans and boycotts inconsistent with the rules of the international trade system, including those imposed by subnational jurisdictions, in order to facilitate long-term management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Forest Principles;		
(c) Recognizing that these matters are also considered in forums with primary competence to address trade issues.		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-135)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p><u>Proposals for action on the relative competitiveness of forest products</u></p> <p>131. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Called upon relevant organizations to support efforts to gather more information and conduct more independent market and economic studies of potential competition between wood and non-wood substitutes, analysing the costs and benefits, including any substitution effects, and the overall impact on management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services</p> <p>2.2.3 Wood and Substitutes in Relation to Other Sectors</p>	<p>Contributing to the implementation of the MCPFE Work Programme, UN/ECE published a study on “The Competitive Climate for Wood Products and Paper Packaging”. Furthermore, UN/ECE is planning a seminar on “Strategies to stimulate and promote the sound use of wood and other forest-based products as environmentally friendly and renewable materials” (tentatively September 2001).</p>
<p>(b) Urged developed countries and relevant international organizations to support efforts by developing countries, consistent with policies and programmes for sustainable forest management to increase their productivity and efficiency in downstream processing activities and support, where appropriate, community-based processing and marketing of wood and non-timber forest products.</p>		
<p><u>Proposals for action on lesser used species</u></p> <p>132. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Called upon countries and relevant international organisations and research institutions to intensify efforts to promote lesser used forest species, in domestic and international markets where increased use is consistent with sustainable forest management;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-135)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(b) Urged producer countries to implement policies which are compatible and consistent with sustainable forest management for the utilization of economically viable lesser used species;		
(c) Urged international organizations and research institutions to transfer technology, and support national and community level efforts to develop and adapt technologies, including traditional forest related knowledge, to increase sustainable utilisation of lesser used species.		
<p><u>Proposals for action on certification and labelling</u></p> <p>133. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Urged countries, within their respective legal frameworks, and international organizations to consider the potentially mutually supportive relationship between sustainable forest management, trade, and voluntary certification and labelling schemes operating in accordance with relevant national legislations to endeavour to ensure, as necessary that such schemes are not used as a form of disguised protectionism, and to help to ensure, as necessary that they do not conflict with international obligations;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.2 Certification and Labelling</p>	<p>The work of the MCPFE on the issue of certification focuses on the assessment of the potential impacts of forest certification systems on SFM, according to the commitment made in Resolution L1. The task of assessing the impact of SFM certification programmes has been the objective of the EU-FAIR research project “Policy Analysis of Certification of Forest Management as a Policy Instrument to Promote Multifunctional Sustainable Forest Management.” The report of this project was published by the MCPFE and the European Commission in spring 2000².</p>

² Ewald Rametsteiner: Sustainable Forest Management Certification – Frame Conditions, System Designs and Impact Assessment; A Policy Analysis of Certification of Forest Management as a Policy Instrument to Promote Multifunctional Sustainable Forest Management; conducted in the context of the EU

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-135)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(b) Invited developed countries and international organizations to support, including through technical and financial assistance, efforts in developing countries to enhance assessment capabilities of developing countries in relation to voluntary certification and labelling;		
(c) Urged countries to support the application to certification schemes of such concepts as: (i) Open access and non-discrimination in respect of all types of forests, forest owners, managers and operators; (ii) Credibility; (iii) Non-deceptiveness; (iv) Cost-effectiveness; (v) Participation that seeks to involve all interested parties, including local communities; (vi) Sustainable forest management; (vii) Transparency;		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-135)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Invited relevant organizations in accordance with their mandate, to carry out further studies on various aspects of voluntary certification and labelling schemes, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Effectiveness in promoting sustainable forest management; (ii) The relationships between various criteria and indicator frameworks and certification; (iii) The issues relevant to the development, implementation, promotion, equivalency and mutual recognition of voluntary certification and labelling schemes, and the role of government in this context; (iv) The special needs of local communities, other forest dependent populations and owners of small forests; (v) The need to monitor practical experience with certification including accreditation processes; (vi) The development of consistent terminology; (vii) Their impacts on relative competitiveness of forest goods and services in the absence of equivalent schemes of the substitutes; (vi) The needs of countries with low forest cover; 	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.2 Certification and Labelling</p>	<p>The report of the EU-FAIR research project “Policy Analysis of Certification of Forest Management as a Policy Instrument to Promote Multifunctional Sustainable Forest Management”, which has been published by the MCPFE and the European Commission, deals with several aspects listed in the IPF proposal, notably aspects (i), (ii), (iii), (v), (vi) and (vii).</p>
<p>(e) Invited countries to consider the relevance to certification schemes of the CIFOR project on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management;</p>		
<p>(f) Urged countries and relevant international organizations dealing with trade in forest products to bring the current trends on certification into perspective, and promote comparability and avoidance duplication of efforts among various voluntary certification and labelling schemes;</p>		
<p>(g) Called upon countries and relevant agencies to make arrangements for and support an exchange of information and experience on certification and labelling schemes in appropriate forums to ensure transparency on an ongoing basis.</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-135)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p><u>Proposals for action on full-cost internalization</u></p> <p>134. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Called upon countries and relevant international organizations concerned with forestry and trade to explore ways and means for full cost internalization of both wood products and non-wood substitutes and undertake market and economic analyses of their implications for forest management and development costs and for sustainable forest management. Such analyses should also examine the potential cost and benefits of improved efficiency and sustainability at all levels of the forest industry;</p>		
<p>(b) Drawing upon the work being carried out by countries and relevant international organizations, encouraged the sharing of information on research findings and experiences of the implementation of full cost internalization and its application to sustainable forest management, and relevant policy mechanisms.</p>		
<p><u>Proposals for action on market transparency</u></p> <p>135. The Panel:</p> <p>(a) Called upon relevant international organizations and national institutions to expand their work on market transparency for trade in forest products and services and to include the possible development of a global database;</p>		
<p>(b) Invited countries to provide an assessment and share relevant information on the nature and extent of illegal trade in forest products and consider measures to counter such illegal trade.</p>		

V. International organisations and multilateral institutions and instruments, including appropriate legal mechanisms

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 144-149)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p><u>Proposals for action</u></p> <p>144. The Panel urged international organizations in cooperation with countries to support and implement the proposals for action of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests.</p>	<p>Lisbon General Declaration, § 3</p>	<p>At the Lisbon Conference the ministers responsible for forests in Europe declared their commitment to “<i>take national as well as co-operative actions towards the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS) concerning the proposals for action agreed at the ad-hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and contributing to the work of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests under the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD/IFF)</i>”.</p>
<p>145. The Panel called upon the appropriate international institutions and organizations to continue their work in the informal high-level Interagency Task Force on Forests, under the chairmanship of FAO as task manager for chapter 11 of Agenda 21 focussing on the proposals for action recommended by the IPF, in accordance with their respective mandates and comparative advantage, and proposed that it should, in a transparent and participatory manner, undertake further coordination and explore means for collaboration and coherent action at international, regional and country levels, in support of any continuing intergovernmental dialogue on forests.</p>		
<p>146. The Panel called on countries:</p> <p>(a) to support the work on forest related issues of international and regional organizations and agencies and under relevant instruments;</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 144-149)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(b) to clarify the mandates of the relevant international institutions and organizations related to forest issues, <i>inter alia</i>, through their respective governing bodies in order to improve integration and coordination of their efforts, and to guide the activities of each organization to areas in which they can be most effective;</p>		
<p>(c) through the respective governing bodies, to work to eliminate waste and duplication, thereby using available resources in an efficient manner;</p>		
<p>(d) to guide relevant international and regional institutions and those administering instruments, through their governing bodies, to accelerate incorporation into their relevant work programmes of the forest related results of UNCED and, of further progress achieved since then, and of the proposals for action recommended by the IPF.</p>		
<p>(e) to support activities related to the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forest.</p>		
<p>147. The Panel examined a number of options for action at the intergovernmental level to continue the intergovernmental policy dialogue on all types of forest and to monitor progress in and promote the implementation of the Panel's proposals for action. It proposed the following options, which were not necessarily seen to be mutually exclusive:</p> <p>(a) To continue the intergovernmental policy dialogue on forests and the consideration of all aspects and programmes aimed at management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests in a holistic manner within existing fora such as the CSD, FAO and their respective institutional structures, as well as other appropriate international organizations, institutions and instruments.</p>		

IPF Proposals for Action (§§ 144-149)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(b) To continue the intergovernmental policy dialogue on forests through the establishment of an ad-hoc, open-ended Intergovernmental Forum on Forests under the auspices of the UN CSD, with a focused and time limited mandate, charged with, <u>inter alia</u>, reviewing, monitoring and reporting on progress in the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests, promoting and monitoring the implementation of the Panel's proposal's for action, and either:</p> <p>(i) On that basis, considering and advising on the need for other arrangements and mechanisms, including legal arrangements covering all types of forests, and reporting on these matters to the CSD at the appropriate time in its work programme, which has yet to be defined; and/or</p> <p>(ii) Preparing the basis and building the necessary consensus for a decision to negotiate and elaborate possible elements of a legally binding instrument, and to report on its work on the latter topic to the CSD in the year 1999.</p>		
<p>(c) To carry forward intergovernmental policy action on forests through the establishment, as soon as possible, under the authority of the UN General Assembly, of an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) on a legally binding instrument on all types of forest, with a focused and time limited mandate.</p>		
<p>148. The Panel also examined numerous detailed suggestions on the mandate and programme of work under the above options. These were noted by the Secretariat for future reference and consideration and will be included in a compilation that will be made available.</p>		
<p>149. The Panel recommended that options b) and c) above, if endorsed, should be serviced by a small secretariat in the CSD Secretariat in DPCSD, and supported by the ITFF.</p>		

ANNEX 2: IFF PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

I. Promoting and facilitating the implementation of the proposals for action of the Intergovernmental panel on forests, and reviewing, monitoring and reporting on progress in the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests

A. Promoting and facilitating implementation (§ 9)

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 9)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>9. The Forum agreed that the following are particularly important for the implementation of IPF's proposals for action:</p> <p>(a) Provision, taking into consideration the relevant chapters of Agenda 21³ and paragraph 10 of the Non-legally Binding Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests (Forest Principles),⁴ by the international donor community, including international organizations and international financial institutions of increased financial resources, including through innovative strategies to mobilize finance, technical assistance and transfer of environmentally sound technology at the international and domestic levels, as well as through better use of existing mechanisms and measures, to support national forest programmes in developing countries, including countries with low forest cover and particularly the least developed countries;</p>		

³ Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, 3-14 June 1992, vol. I, Resolutions Adopted by the Conference (United Nations publications, Sales No.E.93.I.8 and corrigendum), resolutions I, annex II

⁴ Ibid., annex III

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 9)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(b) Promotion, where appropriate, of an integrated approach by countries through their national forest programmes as defined by IPF, and in collaboration with international organizations, to the implementation of the IPF proposals for action and forest-related work as set out under the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>MCPFE work on National Forest Programmes (NFPs) contributes to promoting an integrated approach, as referred to in the proposal for action: the MCPFE workshop on “The Role of National Forest Programmes in the Pan-European Context”, convened in September 1999, confirmed the relevance of the IPF principles and elements of NFPs for Europe. Through an MCPFE questionnaire meanings and dimensions of these principles and elements were further explored. As a result of the questionnaire, the high relevance of consistency with national policies and international commitments as well as of synergies between international forest related initiatives and conventions was confirmed.</p>
<p>(c) Creation and/or strengthening, by countries and international organizations, of initiatives, approaches and partnerships, which could include partnership agreements, to encourage long-term political commitment; relevant, effective, sustained and reliable donor support; and participation by the private sector and major groups; as well as recognition of the special role of official development assistance (ODA) in meeting the needs of developing countries, in particular least developed countries and countries with low forest cover;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 9)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) A systematic assessment, by all countries, of IPF's proposals for action and planning for their implementation in the context of countries' own national processes aimed at sustainable forest management;</p>	<p>Lisbon General Declaration (LGD)</p>	<p>At the Lisbon Conference the ministers responsible for forests in Europe declared their commitment to <i>“take national as well as co-operative actions towards the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS) concerning the proposals for action agreed at the ad-hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and contributing to the work of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests under the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD/IFF)”</i>.</p>
<p>(e) Implementation by countries of the IPF's proposals for action in the context of their national forest programmes/national policy framework in a coordinated manner and with the participation of all interested parties. Clear objectives and criteria should help promote effective implementation of sustainable forest management. The policy framework should be kept under review in order to continue to embody capabilities for intersectoral planning, coordination and implementation, and adequate resource allocation;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>The proposal for action encourages the implementation of the IPF proposals “in a co-ordinated manner” in the context of their NPFs/national policy framework. Work of the MCPFE on NFPs contributes to achieving such a co-ordinated approach by achieving a common understanding on concept and basic principles/elements of NFPs in the pan-European context.</p> <p>Regarding clear objectives and criteria for implementation of SFM, the Pan-European Criteria for SFM could be considered as such criteria/objectives.</p>
<p>(f) Establishment, by each country, of a focal point to guide and coordinate the implementation and assessment process of the IPF's proposals for action, including the participation of all relevant interested parties;</p>		

B. Monitoring progress in implementation (§§ 16-19)

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 16-19)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
16. IFF recalled the IPF proposals for action that are relevant to this category (in particular, E/CN.17/1997/12, paras. 17 (i), 17 (g), 70 (e), 77 (f), 78 (b), 78 (c), 115 (a) and 115 (b)).		
<p>17. IFF encouraged countries to:</p> <p>(a) Prepare national information on the management, conservation, and sustainable development of all types of forests as the basis for any consolidated information on forests at the international level. Adequate financial resources, both domestic and international, should be available for capacity-building and implementation of national reporting initiatives;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p> <p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.1 Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Towards Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems 4.2.3 Pan-European Reporting on SFM</p>	<p>Through the Temperate and Boreal Forest Resources Assessment 2000 (TBFRA-2000) consolidated information on European forests has been provided. Data were collected on most of the pan-European quantitative indicators for SFM. They were supplied by national correspondents (basis: national forest inventories), adjusted to conform to international definitions, and validated by UN-ECE/FAO.</p> <p>The actions included in the MCPFE Work Programme on Element “Criteria and Indicators for SFM” will contribute to further improve data collection and pan-European reporting on European forests as well as to enhance international comparability of this information.</p>
<p>(b) Make forest-related information for reviewing, monitoring and reporting progress in implementation of sustainable forest management widely available and accessible to policy makers and to interested groups, noting the important role that subnational levels of government and interested groups play in contributing to assessment and information gathering;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>Data collected on pan-European indicators by the TBFRA-2000 are widely available, both to policy makers as well as to interested groups, e.g through the internet.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 16-19)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(c) Report on the implementation of IPF proposals for action in the context of reporting on forests to the Commission on Sustainable Development at its eighth session, taking into account, where appropriate, the process used to assess the relevance of the proposals and priorities for action, the organizations and interested parties involved, and noting progress made and the areas where new actions could be undertaken;</p>		
<p>(d) Further develop and implement, with the support of international organizations, as appropriate, criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, and use them as a basis for reviewing, monitoring and reporting national trends in the state of forests, as well as progress on the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.1 Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Towards Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems 4.2.3 Pan-European Reporting on SFM</p>	<p>The improvement and further development of the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for SFM constitutes an important element of the MCPFE Work Programme. These Pan-European Criteria and Indicators (C&I) for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) constitute the referential basis for the development of national sets of C&I.</p>
<p>(e) Encourage the donor community to assist developing countries in preparing national information and reports on forests, recognizing that information collection and reporting are costly activities.</p>		
<p>18. IFF encouraged ITFF member organizations and other relevant international and regional organizations to:</p> <p>(a) Consult with countries regarding collection and synthesis of national information, to facilitate accurate reporting with a view to having countries verify the information synthesized, and give effective feedback on the overall results of data collection and reporting and make such information widely available and accessible to policy makers and to interested groups.</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 16-19)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>19. IFF encouraged countries, ITFF member organizations and other relevant international and regional organizations to:</p> <p>(a) Develop harmonized, cost-effective, comprehensive reporting formats for collecting and synthesizing national forest information to meet the diverse demands for reliable and timely data by various forest-related international organizations and instruments. There is a need to incorporate information on relevant criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, including indicators on environmental, social and economic functions, such as non-wood products, forest resources and services, and the competitiveness of forest products at the domestic and international levels, into such reporting formats in order to reduce reporting burdens on countries and increase the timeliness and consistency of reporting;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p> <p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Towards Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems 4.2.3 Pan-European Reporting on SFM</p>	<p>As stated with respect to Proposal 8 above, information on most of the pan-European quantitative indicators for SFM – which cover most of the aspects of environmental, social and economic functions, as referred to in Proposal 10 – have been collected through the TBFRA-2000. Preliminary results were reported to the Third Ministerial Conference (Lisbon, 1998), and final results have been made broadly available, e.g. through the internet.</p> <p>However, the MCPFE has also acknowledged the need for further harmonisation of data collection and the further development of harmonised reporting formats: Action 4.2.2 of the MCPFE Work Programme aims to explore possibilities to harmonise forest-related data collection and reporting systems in Europe.</p>
<p>(b) Improve the effectiveness of coordination and partnership within countries and with international organizations and instruments as a means of building the capacity in developing countries for periodic and timely collection, review, synthesis and utilization of information related to sustainable forest management.</p>		

II. Matters left pending and other issues arising from the programme elements of the intergovernmental panel on forests process

A. Need for financial resources (§§ 30-31)

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 30-31)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>30. The IFF recalled the IPF proposals for action relevant to this programme element including paragraphs 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71, and called upon countries and relevant international organisations to:</p> <p>(a) Increase financial resources and make or intensify efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of available resources for SFM, and use national forest programmes or other integrated programmes as the basis for channeling, prioritizing and increasing financial assistance to the forest sector in developing countries;</p>		
<p>(b) Give special consideration to developing countries, including countries with low forest cover and particularly the least developed countries, in financial cooperation to meet their needs for forest products and services sustainably and sustainably manage their forests, and in some cases expand their forest cover;</p>		
<p>(c) Encourage private investments in SFM by providing a stable and transparent investment environment within an adequate regulatory framework that also encourages the re-investment of forest revenues into SFM;</p>		
<p>(d) Undertake activities for systematic collection and analysis of financial flows data in the forest sector in order to enable informed and rational policy decisions based on reliable information;</p>		
<p>(e) Explore the feasibility of operationalising an investment promotion entity taking into account the functions and circumstances under which such an entity would operate as well as its scope in relation to the existing financial mechanisms.</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 30-31)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>31. The Forum discussed, but was not able to reach consensus on the following proposals for action:</p> <p>(a) Continue further exploration, identification, and development of <i>new and</i> improved and more effective financial mechanisms, and further explore the potential and results of innovative use of existing mechanisms to promote SFM, taking into account the full range of goods and services, including forest related biological resources, and sharing experience and information on such mechanisms;</p>		
<p>(b) Create an international forest fund to support, inter alia, the additional costs during the transition period towards SFM;</p>		
<p>(c) Make full use of the potential of existing mechanisms, such as GEF consistent with their mandates, and explore options to expand their scope/ and review their scope for financing a wider range of SFM activities.</p>		
<p>(d) Consider the need for preparing a study integrating such issues as the valuation of forest goods and services, including biological resources, and the international trade of forest goods, taking due account of the effects of international restrictions, such as tariff escalations, and other protective measures.</p>		

B. Trade and environment (§§ 41-42)

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 41-42)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>41. IFF stressed the importance of implementing the IPF proposals for action on trade and environment. In order to further their effective implementation IFF:</p> <p>(a) Urged countries, including trade partners, to contribute to achieving trade in wood and non-wood products and services from sustainably managed forests, and implement policies and actions, in particular avoiding policies that have adverse effects, either on trade or on sustainable forest management;</p>		
<p>(b) Urged countries, international organisations, including WTO⁵, and other interested parties to undertake as appropriate, further cooperative work on voluntary certification and/or labelling schemes, in line with the recommendations of IPF, while seeking to enhance their international comparability and considering their equivalence, taking into account the diversity of national and regional situations, and to ensure adequate transparency and non-discrimination in the design and operation of such schemes, and are consistent with international obligations, so as to promote sustainable forest management and not to lead to unjustifiable obstacles to market access;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.2 Certification and Labelling</p>	<p>The work of the MCPFE on certification focuses on the assessment of the potential impacts of quality assurance systems and programmes such as voluntary and independent forest certification systems on SFM, according to the commitment to Future Action 11 of Resolution L1.</p>
<p>(c) Urged countries to undertake analyses of the implications of full-cost internalization on forest management and economic development and implement full-cost internalization strategies for forest products and services and their substitutes;</p>		
<p>(d) Requested countries, international organizations and other interested parties to undertake further work on full life-cycle analysis of the environmental impacts of forest products and their substitutes;</p>		

⁵ The Forum discussed, but could not reach consensus to the specific reference to WTO in this context.

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 41-42)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(e) Called upon all interested parties to take action to improve market transparency, taking into account the role of the private sector, to help promote responsible producer and consumer choices in the supply and demand for forest products, forest services and their substitutes;		
(f) Called upon countries to consider appropriate national-level actions and promote international cooperation to reduce the illegal trade in wood and non-wood forest products including forest related biological resources, with the aim of its elimination;		
(g) Urged countries to develop strategies for sustainable forest management with a long-term perspective so that the negative effects of short-term market changes, such as the recent regional financial crises, can be minimized;		
(h) Urged countries to recognize the special importance of imports of forest products for countries with low forest cover and fragile forest ecosystems, and small island developing States to satisfy their needs for forest products and services to assist them in expanding and rehabilitating their forest cover.		
<p>42. The Forum discussed, but was not able to reach consensus on the following proposal for action:</p> <p>“Supported continued efforts by countries and the World Trade Organization towards trade liberalization giving special attention to removing remaining and emerging trade restrictions which constrain market access, particularly for value added forest products.”</p>		

C. Transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management (§ 56)

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 56)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>56. IFF stressed the importance of implementing the IPF proposals for action on the transfer of environmentally sound technologies. In order to further their effective implementation, IFF:</p> <p>(a) Urged countries, consistent with decision 6/3 of the Commission on Sustainable Development as well as paragraph 77 of the IPF proposals for action to initiate actions towards the broadening and development of mechanisms and/or further initiatives to enhance the transfer of technology from developed countries to developing countries to promote sustainable forest management;</p>		
<p>(b) Urged all countries to develop an enabling policy, legal and institutional framework that encourages appropriate public and private sector investments in environmentally sound technologies for sustainable forest management in line with the respective national forest programmes, where applicable;</p>		
<p>(c) Urged countries and relevant international organizations to support the strengthening of cooperation between institutions to facilitate the assessment of needs for adaptation and transfer of forest-related environmentally sound technologies through North-South and South-South cooperation. Those institutions recognized as centres of excellence should act as clearing houses, in line with Agenda 21, Chapter 34, in order to expedite the flow of these technologies;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 56)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Urged all countries to recognize the importance of the transfer of technologies to developing countries and economies in transition, including human and institutional capacity-building, as an integral part of the process of investment and sustainable development; and the importance of combining technology transfer with training, education and institutional strengthening in order to promote effective use and broad dissemination of environmentally sound technologies;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.4: Countries in Transition</p> <p>Work Programme Element 2.3: Training, Education and Gender Aspects</p>	<p>The activities of the MCPFE on Work Programme Elements “Countries in Transition (CITs)” as well as “Training, Education and Gender Aspects” contribute to the implementation of the proposal. While human and institutional capacity building - which by IFF has been identified as an integral part of investment and sustainable development - is among the priority areas of follow-up work of Helsinki Resolution H3, a number of international workshops and seminars organised by FAO/ECE/ILO and by the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations (IUFRO) focus on various aspects of forest related training and education.</p>
<p>(e) Urged all countries, in particular developed countries, to take further concrete measures to promote and facilitate the transfer of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed, taking into account the need to protect intellectual property rights in accordance with the relevant international and domestic laws, in order to put into further practice the recommendations of Agenda 21, the Commission on Sustainable Development and IPF, and in this context to mobilize further support for the development and application of appropriate technologies and corresponding know-how within these countries to enhance their capacities to implement sustainable forest management;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 56)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(f) Urged countries and relevant international organizations to consider practical measures to promote the diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to end-users, particularly in local communities in developing countries, through the efficient use of extension services;</p>		
<p>(g) Urged countries and relevant international organizations to enhance partnerships, and to initiate, as appropriate, coordinate and cooperate in forest-related technical and financial assistance and capacity-building in respect of the transfer, development and application of environmentally sound technologies;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.4: Countries in Transition</p> <p>Work Programme Element 2.3: Training, Education and Gender Aspects</p>	<p>By adopting Helsinki Resolution H3 the MCPFE has initiated an on-going process of co-operation with and assistance to CEECs. As already indicated, this process consists of a multitude of bilateral and multilateral projects which are documented in a special database developed by UN-ECE/FAO (downloadable from the internet). These projects <i>inter alia</i> focus on environmentally sound technologies.</p> <p>Furthermore, the seminar on forest operations of tomorrow (September 1999) and workshop on “New Trends in Wood Harvesting with Cable Cranes” (June 2001), which are two of the actions implementing Work Programme Element “Training, Education and Gender Aspects” and which are convened by the FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training contribute to the transfer of environmentally sound technologies.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 56)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(h) Encouraged countries, with the cooperation of international organizations, to promote appropriate transfer of environmentally sound rehabilitation technologies for the sustainable management of forest ecosystems in environmentally critical areas, and to develop appropriate means to promote sharing of environmentally sound technologies between and within countries, including effective links between research, extension and implementation;</p>		
<p>(i) Underscored the importance of assisting developing countries with low forest cover and those with fragile forest ecosystems in their efforts in respect of capacity-building that would facilitate the development and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to address those needs;</p>		
<p>(j) Urged countries to promote fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of forest genetic resources (as defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity) and the results and applications of research, upon mutually agreed terms, and to work, as necessary, on addressing issues of the identification of origins of forest genetic resources within their intellectual property rights, sui-generis or other relevant systems for protection, as appropriate, taking into account the work being advanced by the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international agreements, in accordance with national laws;</p>		
<p>(k) The Forum also discussed but could not conclude the debate or reach consensus on the proposal to encourage countries to develop appropriate mechanisms and/or measures to enable indigenous people, local communities and forest-dependent groups to realise the potential benefits of traditional forest-related knowledge in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity, through the establishment and enforcement of intellectual property rights linked to this knowledge including the giving of due recognition to the use of traditional forest-related knowledge in patent applications for technologies;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 56)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(l) Urged all countries, in particular developed countries, to pursue actions that would facilitate the transfer, development and application of environmentally sound technologies for and analyse the implications of the use of wood and non-wood by-products created by forest harvesting and wood processing for industrial and domestic purposes, giving special attention to wood-waste materials as an energy source;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2.3: Wood and Substitutes in Relation to Other Sectors</p>	<p>A seminar on strategies to stimulate and promote the sound use of wood and other forest-based products as environmentally friendly and renewable materials will be organised by the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training tentatively in September 2001 in contributing to the implementation of Work Programme Element "Wood and Substitutes in Relation to Other Sectors".</p>
<p>(m) Called upon countries to undertake steps to ensure equal opportunities for women, in particular indigenous women and women in rural areas, to become beneficiaries of environmentally sound forest-related technologies, know-how and extension services;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.3: Training, Education and Gender Aspects</p>	<p>Although the seminar "Women in Forestry" convened by the Government of Portugal and the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training in co-operation with IUFRO in April 2001, did not specifically address the question of equality of opportunities for women with regard to environmentally sound forest-related technologies, know-how and extension services, it succeeded in generating and enhancing information about the actual situation of women in the forestry sector (representation of women in workforce and decision making, opportunities and main obstacles, etc.) and in developing ideas and strategies for ways forward. The seminar also elaborated a number of recommendations for action at national level as well as by international organisations.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§ 56)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(n) Urged countries to strengthen outreach programmes targeted at women in the areas of education, training and microcredit, related to community development programmes and household use of wood, wood lots for fuelwood and energy-efficient cooking technology;		
(o) Urged countries and relevant international organizations to use data and information that are disaggregated by gender in sectoral surveys and studies used in the development of technologies for sustainable forest		

D. Issues that need further clarification

1. *Underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation (§§ 63-67)*

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 63-67)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>63. IFF recalls the following IPF proposals for action relevant to this programme element (see E/CN.17/1997/12, paras. 17 (e), 17 (f), 27 to 31, 67 (g), 70 (c) and 77 (f)).</p>		
<p>64. IFF stressed the importance of implementing the IPF proposals for action on underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, with particular emphasis on the needs and requirements of low forest cover countries and countries with fragile forest ecosystems. In order to further their effective implementation, IFF encouraged countries, with the assistance of international organizations, donor countries and financial institutions, to implement the following additional proposals through partnerships involving, where appropriate, the participation of government institutions, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, indigenous and local communities, forest owners and the private sector:</p> <p>(a) Further study and take practical measures to address the chains of causality of the underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation within each country, including the impact of poverty as well as the impact of processes outside the forest sector;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 63-67)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(b) Create appropriate procedures in order to promote effective participation of all interested parties in decision-making about forest management;	Work Programme Element 1.2: Public Participation	In contributing to the MCPFE Work Programme, the Team of Specialists on Participation and Partnership in Forestry had been established by the Joint FAO/ECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training in order to clarify the concept of participation and to develop a conceptual framework. The Team of Specialists published the working paper “Public Participation in Forestry in Europe and North America” in September 2000 (International Labour Office, WP. 163).
(c) Support appropriate land tenure law and/or arrangements as a means to define clearly land ownership, as well as the rights of indigenous and local communities and forest owners, for the sustainable use of forest resources, taking into account the sovereign right of each country and its legal framework;	Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes	The MCPFE <i>inter alia</i> identified the recognition of regional and respect for customary and traditional rights and secure land tenure arrangements as relevant elements of NFPs in the pan-European context. Thus, further clarification of the meanings and dimensions of these element could also contribute to implementing the proposal for action.
(d) Develop mechanisms, as appropriate, to improve land access and use of forest resources on a sustainable basis;	Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management	With the “Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management”, endorsed by the ministers in Resolution L2, the MCPFE has developed a common pan-European tool which aims to further promote sustainable forest management in Europe by translating the international commitments down to the level of forest management planning and practices. The PEOLG represent a common framework of recommendations for reference at the field level that can be used on a voluntary basis.

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 63-67)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(e) Support capacity-building in communities, in particular for those with responsibilities in forest management, including in low forest cover countries, and create awareness in the society at large on the importance of issues related to deforestation and forest degradation;</p>	<p>Strasbourg Resolutions, notably S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems S3: Decentralised European Data Bank on Forest Fires S6: European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems</p>	<p>Information on issues related to deforestation and forest degradation is provided through multiple reporting, publishing and public awareness activities in the follow-up of the Strasbourg Resolutions (see also IPF proposal for action § 30 (a)). All these information activities <i>inter alia</i> aim to create awareness in the society at large on the importance of issues related to deforestation and forest degradation.</p>
<p>(f) Support and promote community involvement in sustainable forest management through technical guidance, economic incentives and, where appropriate, legal frameworks;</p>		
<p>(g) Promote maintenance and enhancement of forest resources through sustainable forest management practices, and promote the creation of new forest resources through the establishment of planted forests and other means, such as rehabilitation of degraded forests, taking into consideration their social, cultural and environmental impacts, and economic costs and benefits;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>As was already mentioned above, the “Pan-European Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management” aim to serve as a common pan-European tool to further promote sustainable forest management in Europe by translating the international commitments down to the level of forest management planning and notably also to that one of forest management practices.</p>
<p>(h) Identify and measure internalization of externalities, and introduce positive incentives both in the forest and non-forest sectors which may help combat deforestation and forest degradation;</p>		
<p>(i) Support local community programmes for capacity-building and credit facilities, and facilitate access to domestic and external markets of forest products and services;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 63-67)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(j) Request international financial institutions to analyse the impacts of foreign debt on deforestation and forest degradation, and request international financial institutions to explore in cooperation with donor and recipient countries, innovative financial approaches and schemes for helping countries to promote sustainable forest management.		
65. IFF invited international financial institutions to strengthen transparency in decision-making as it effects sustainable forest management, and to ensure that their policies support sustainable forest management.		
66. IFF also invited countries to use national forest programmes, as appropriate, or other relevant programmes to involve indigenous and local communities and women to participate in the formulation and implementation of measures that aim to protect their rights and privileges in relation to forest lands, traditional forest-related knowledge and forest biological resources (as defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity).		
67. IFF encouraged ITFF member organizations to support the elaboration of a comprehensive study of land tenure issues related to deforestation and forest degradation.		

2. *Traditional forest-related knowledge (§§ 73-75)*

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 73-75)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
73. IFF recalled IPF proposals for action relevant to this programme element (in particular, E/CN.17/1997/12, paras. 40 (a) to 40 (r) and 132 (c)).		
74. IFF called upon countries to: (a) Implement effective measures to recognise, respect, protect and maintain traditional forest-related knowledge in sustainable forest management, including forest biological resources (as defined by the CBD) within their intellectual property rights, <i>sui-generis</i> or other relevant systems for protection, as appropriate, taking into account the relevant work being advanced by the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international agreements;		
(b) Promote fair and equitable sharing of benefits, including consideration of payments, where appropriate, arising from the use of such knowledge, innovations and practices, in accordance with, <i>inter alia</i> , article 8 (j) and related provisions of articles 15, 16 and 19 of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international agreements and taking into account national law, with the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices;		
(c) Work with relevant international organisations to help develop a common appreciation and understanding of the relationship between the intellectual property rights, <i>sui-generis</i> or other relevant systems for protection, and the Convention on Biological Diversity, including work, as necessary, on addressing issues of the identification of origins of traditional forest-related knowledge, and of the knowledge that results from the use of forest genetic resources (as defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity), with a view to protecting such knowledge from inappropriate use;		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 73-75)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Develop or strengthen, as appropriate, and implement, at the national level, legislation and policies to achieve objectives under articles 8 (j), and related provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and support efforts by relevant international organisations and institutions regarding protection and application of traditional forest-related knowledge, which can include the development of guidelines, in accordance with their mandates.</p>		
<p>75. IFF invited Conference of Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, with the participation of indigenous people and local communities, through the Ad-Hoc Open-ended Inter-sessional Working Group, in its programme of work, under the related provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, to include options for collecting, recording, applying and locating traditional forest-related knowledge, recognizing the need to foster the wider application of such knowledge, innovations and practices, with approval and effective involvement of the holders throughout the process.</p>		

3. *Forest conservation and protected areas (§§ 83-90)*

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 83-90)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>83. The Forum recalled the proposals made by the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests for action relevant to this programme element (in particular, E/CN.17/1997/12, paras. 17 (f), 17 (l), 58 (b) (v), 67 (f) and 77 (f)).</p>		
<p>84. The Forum invited countries to implement, with the assistance of international organizations, donor countries and financial institutions, the proposals for action of this new programme element through partnership mechanisms involving, where appropriate, the participation of government institutions, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, and indigenous and local communities.</p>		
<p>85. The Forum encouraged countries to:</p> <p>(a) Commit themselves to the protection, conservation and representativeness of all types of forests, consistent with national forest policies and programmes that recognize the linkage between forest conservation and sustainable development. This commitment may be achieved through a range of conservation mechanisms, reflecting varying national circumstances, applied within and outside of protected forest areas, and the complementary roles of protected forest areas and other sustainable forest management activities, for example, the production of wood and non-wood products and services, where forest conservation is promoted by other means;</p>	<p>Helsinki Resolution H2: General Guidelines for the Conservation of the Biodiversity of European Forests</p> <p>Lisbon General Declaration (LGD) – Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000</p>	<p>The commitment to the conservation, protection and sustainable management of European forests constitutes and its contribution to sustainable development is the driving force behind the MCPFE process. The ministers responsible for forests in Europe have demonstrated this entire commitment in many ways. Helsinki Resolution H2 and the Work Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000 can only be pointed out as examples of this commitment.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 83-90)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(b) Develop and implement appropriate strategies for the protection of the full range of forest values, including cultural, social, spiritual, environmental and economic aspects; recognition of the multiple functions and sustainable use of all types of forests, with particular regard to biological diversity; community and other interested parties' participation; integration of indigenous and local communities livelihood needs; and planning and management on an ecosystem basis, in which respect special emphasis should be put on the continued integrity of genetic diversity;</p>	<p>Helsinki Resolutions H1: General Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Europe H2: General Guidelines for the Conservation of the Biodiversity of European Forests LGD – Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000</p> <p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>See comment on proposal § 10 (a) above.</p> <p>The definition of sustainable forest management agreed upon by the MCPFE at the Helsinki Conference (1993) constitutes the common conceptual basis for forest management in the whole European region: “Sustainable management means the stewardship and use of forests and forest lands in a way and at a rate, that maintains their biodiversity, productivity, regeneration capacity, vitality and their potential to fulfil, now and in the future, relevant ecological, economic and social functions at local, national., and global levels, and that does not cause damage to other ecosystems.” (Helsinki Resolution H1).</p> <p>Furthermore, questions of participation and integration of indigenous and local communities are embodied in the work of the MCPFE on NFPs.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 83-90)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(c) Develop and implement forest management mechanisms, as appropriate, which provide for partnerships and the participation of forest owners, indigenous and local communities in support of forest conservation initiatives for sustainable forest management within the legal framework of each country;</p>	<p>Helsinki Resolutions H1: General Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Europe H2: General Guidelines for the Conservation of the Biodiversity of European Forests</p> <p>LGD – Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000</p> <p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p> <p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes:</p>	<p>See comments proposals § 10 (a) and § 11 (a) above.</p>
<p>(d) Develop financial support mechanisms to engage all interested parties, in particular forest owners and the private sector, in the planning and management of protected forest areas; and recognize forest protected areas under the stewardship of private forest owners or indigenous and local communities;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 83-90)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(e) Develop and apply consistently, as needed, criteria based on the adequacy, consistency and effectiveness of protected areas following an ecosystem approach, and incorporating reserve design principles that identify need for new protected areas critical to the protection and maintenance of environmental services. In this regard, consideration should be given to linking protected areas, where possible, with corridors and buffer zones and other appropriate means in order to form networks;</p>	<p>LGD – Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000</p> <p>Work Programme Element 3.1: Biological and Landscape Diversity</p>	<p>The objectives of the proposal are adequately reflected in the implementation of Objective 2 of the “Biodiversity Work-Programme”. It was e.g. agreed that adequacy, connectivity and effectiveness should be used as basic principles for selection of protected forest areas. Objective 2 <i>inter alia</i> states that whenever appropriate, it should consider not only the conservation of high value selected sites, but also the connectivity of such sites guarantying that particular species are able to migrate and colonise other sites while remaining viable in their current distribution.</p>
<p>(f) Develop and implement a range of innovative mechanisms for financing and encouraging forest conservation including economic incentives, voluntary guidelines, forest regulations, private contracts, taxes and charges, reinvestment of returns from protected areas, forest-related industries, and environmental services in forest conservation; tax deductions for private forest conservation; direct charges for protected area use; and possible returns from carbon sequestration, in accordance with, and within the context of the implementation of relevant articles of the Kyoto Protocol and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 83-90)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(g) Contribute to a global and regional assessment of the current status of protected forest areas, including total number, extent of each area, objectives of establishment, effectiveness of management, IUCN system equivalent category, and basic biological and social information available. This can help towards the establishment of biogeographically balanced networks of forest protected areas.</p>	<p>LGD – Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000</p> <p>Work Programme Element 3.1: Biological and Landscape Diversity</p>	<p>As a necessary prerequisite for the implementation of Objective 2 of the “Biodiversity Work Programme” further work of the MCPFE on protected forest areas notably aims to achieve a common pan-European understanding of definitions and categories of protected areas. The discussion is based on a data collection on the status of protected forest areas in European countries. In this context, the relation of the European situation to the international classification system of protected areas of the IUCN is analysed.</p>
<p>86. The Forum encouraged countries that share ecologically important or unique transboundary forests to establish joint protected forest areas, including ecological corridors of regional and/or global significance, and establish agreed guidelines concerning their collaborative management.</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 83-90)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>87. The Forum called upon countries, international financial institutions and other donors to provide financial support and other resources to activities in developing countries related to forest conservation, and the implementation and management of protected areas under their surrounding landscapes, in accordance with national action plans, where such plans exist, through, <i>inter alia</i>, institutional strengthening and capacity-building; research and education and public awareness; promotion of access, development and transfer of environmentally sound technologies; and technical and scientific cooperation.</p>		
<p>88. The Forum encouraged countries, relevant international organizations and institutions to cooperate to develop methodologies for assessing the conditions of and management effectiveness in existing protected forest areas and their surrounding landscapes, as well as forest protected areas networks, taking into account the various efforts under way in several countries to further build capacity to collect, organize, utilize and share information and experience, including indigenous and local knowledge, in order to create and manage protected forest areas.</p>	<p>LGD – Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000</p> <p>Work Programme Element 3.1: Biological and Landscape Diversity</p>	<p>In co-operating with UN/ECE and COST Action E4⁶ in its work on protected forest areas, the MCPFE contributes to enhancing capacity to collect, analyse and share information and experience and information at the pan-European level.</p>
<p>89. The Forum invited countries, relevant international organizations and institutions to work collectively to further develop guidelines for consistency in the interpretation and use of existing IUCN categories of protected areas for application in a national context, as well as to develop a global approach for assessing the effectiveness of protected forest areas management in relation to environmental, social, cultural and other relevant objectives.</p>	<p>LGD – Work-Programme on the Conservation and Enhancement of Biological and Landscape Diversity in Forest Ecosystems 1997-2000</p> <p>Work Programme Element 3.1: Biological and Landscape Diversity</p>	<p>See comment proposal § 10 (g) above.</p>
<p>90. The Forum urged countries, international financial institutions and other donors to improve coordination, at both the national and international levels, of policies and programmes that affect forest conservation, and address cross-sectoral policies, structural adjustment packages and perverse incentives.</p>		

⁶ COST Action E4: "Forest Reserves Research Network"

4. Forest research (§§ 95-98)

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 95-98)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
95 IFF recalled IPF proposals for action 94 (a), 94 (c) and 94 (d), and underlined that forest research should have a country-driven approach.		
96. IFF called upon countries to: (a) Improve national efforts to strengthen forest research by formulating policies, programmes and strategies, as appropriate, within the context of national forest programmes in order to identify research needs and priorities as well as to coordinate the implementation of research programmes relevant to sustainable forest management;		
(b) Consider examination of new ways of mobilizing funding for forest research, including changes to the charters of research institutions that would allow them to address diverse sources of funding, as well as changes to research agendas;		
(c) Improve linkage between forest science and forest policy processes at the national and subnational levels by creating opportunities for policy makers, scientists, donors, and other interested parties to provide guidance to research and forest policy discussions;		
(d) Ensure that forest research in countries be undertaken with prior consent of the country/countries concerned.		
97. IFF urged international organizations, donor countries and financial institutions to: (a) Contribute to fund forest research in developing countries;		
(b) Examine new ways for mobilizing funding for forest research and intensify efforts, including development assistance, to strengthen research networks and build capacity at the national, regional and global levels, to facilitate all countries to meet the broad economic, social, cultural and environmental demands upon forests;		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 95-98)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(c) Enhance access to forest-related information by all interested parties, making best use of existing institutions, mechanisms and networks, including national, regional and international research information systems;</p>	<p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p> <p>Helsinki Resolution H3: Forestry Co-operation with Countries with Economies in Transition</p> <p>Strasbourg Resolutions, notably S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems S3: Decentralised European Data Bank on Forest Fires S6: European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems</p>	<p>Access to forest-related Information is provided through multiple reporting, publishing and public awareness activities of the MCPFE. For example, results of the monitoring activities carried out in the follow-up of Strasbourg Resolution S1 are published annually by UN/ECE and the European Commission. Furthermore, a decentralised database containing Forest Fire Statistics (S3) and on research into forest ecosystems (containing 1.198 institutions, scientists and projects) have been established in the internet.</p> <p>In the follow-up of the resolution H3, an electronic database has been developed by UN-ECE/FAO which contains information on about 500 projects of assistance and co-operation reported by donor and recipient countries. Also this database is available in the internet.</p> <p>In addition, the MCPFE contributes to providing information on the multiple roles of forests through its manifold reporting (e.g. on the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for SFM) and public relations activities (including a broad range of publications and the MCPFE internet web-sites).</p>
<p>(d) Foster joint ventures in forest research involving both the public (research institutions) and private sector.</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 95-98)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>98. IFF requested the ITFF member organizations to:</p> <p>(a) Explore ways and means of improving priority setting and support for national, regional and international forest-related research efforts;</p>		
<p>(b) Explore options for providing guidance to forest science initiatives, strengthening linkages between science and policy, mobilizing resources, including financial resources, and increasing international efforts in support of forest research and research capacity-building;</p>		
<p>(c) Work with IUFRO in exploring possibilities for a global forest information service.</p>		

5. Valuation of forest goods and services (§§ 106-107)

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 196-107)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
106. The Forum recalled the IPF proposals for action relevant to this programme element (in particular, E/CN.17/1997/12, paras. 104 (a), (b), (c) and 134 (a) and (b)).		
107. The Forum: (a) Urged Governments to improve collection of quantitative data to enumerate and develop physical accounts of the full range of forest goods and services, including inventories of timber and other goods and services, and impacts of changes in forest use on the environment. This should also be done for substitute non-wood materials;	Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM 4.2.1 Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Towards Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems	The work of the MCPFE on improving the pan-European indicators for SFM notably also focuses on socio-economic indicators (Criterion 6) as one important area for improvement.
(b) Encouraged further development, by countries and international organizations, of rapid and low-cost valuation methods, including a focus on the development of approaches which incorporate a wide range of values, reflect the overall value of forest ecosystems, as appropriate, and identify the costs and benefits of sustainable forest management, as well as ways to internalize externalities;	Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.1 Valuation of Goods and Services	In its work on valuation of goods and services derived from forests the MCPFE focuses on the range of open questions related, as e.g. low comparability and political implications. The Czech Republic, in co-operation with the MCPFE, convened an international seminar on the valuation of forest goods and services, including valuation of environmental values, tentatively in November 2000.
(c) Requested relevant international organizations to develop and test rapid valuation methods that are policy relevant and efficient, that reflect regional and national characteristics and requirements, and to develop approaches for the identification of the costs and benefits, including incremental costs and benefits, of sustainable forest management which can be employed for a cost-efficient use of investment funds for forests;		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 196-107)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
(d) Requested countries and international organizations to assist developing countries in building and promoting capacity for the development and application of forest valuation methods.		

6. *Economic instruments, tax policies and land tenure (§ 115)*

IFF Proposals for Action (§115)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>115. The Forum:</p> <p>(a) Encouraged countries, with the assistance of relevant international organizations, to assess the potential scope and effective combination of economic instruments and tax policies as tools for promoting sustainable forest management, as appropriate, as part of their national forest programmes. This assessment should include but not be limited to collection of forest revenue from timber extraction;</p>		
<p>(b) Encouraged countries to recognize and use, where applicable, an appropriate combination of regulations and economic instruments for achieving the objectives of forest policies, including the use of charges and forest revenue collection that also offer incentives for sustainable forest management practices;</p>		
<p>(c) Encouraged countries to recognize the actual and potential impacts of economic instruments and tax policies as a means of providing incentives to engage in activities that avoid deforestation and forest degradation and that support sustainable forest management practices; and to examine, in collaboration with international organizations, when requested, the role of forest policy failures and policies in other sectors as a contributing factor in deforestation, forest degradation or unsustainable forest management; and to collaborate with international organizations in developing mitigating policies;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.1: Rural Development</p> <p>2.1.1 Rural Development Concept and Forest Policy in Europe</p> <p>2.1.2 Contribution of Forests and Forestry to Rural Development in Europe</p>	<p>Although the MCPFE does not entirely focus on the role of forest policy failures and policies in other sectors as a contributing factor in deforestation, forest degradation or unsustainable forest management, in its work on rural development it puts special emphasis on the relation to other sectors and the need for coherence of forest policies with programme and activities in other sectors.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§115)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Encouraged countries, within their respective legal framework, to support land tenure policies that recognize and respect legitimate access and use, and property rights in order to support sustainable forest management and investment, recognizing that institutionalizing tenure is a long-term and complex process which requires interim measures to address urgent needs, in particular of local and/or indigenous communities;</p>		
<p>(e) Requested relevant international organizations to undertake an up-to-date review of contemporary forest revenue collection systems for the use of forest products and services. The Forum encouraged countries to share their experiences in this area and to support this effort;</p>		
<p>(f) Invited relevant international organizations to provide, on request, general and specific advice to countries on the design and administration of economic instruments and tax policies to promote sustainable forest management, and encouraged countries to offer examples of successes in using economic instruments to advance the practice of sustainable forest management;</p>		
<p>(g) Encouraged countries to develop macroeconomic policies and policies in other sectors that support and contribute to sustainable forest management; and requested international financial and lending institutions to consider mitigating the impacts of macroeconomic structural adjustment programmes on forests consistent with sustainable forest management.</p>		

7. *Future supply of and demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services (§§ 121-122)*

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 121-122)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>121. The Forum encourages countries and international organizations to improve data collection and information dissemination through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Increasing the extent, quality and comparability of inventory data on forest resources, including both wood and non-wood forest products and services; (ii) Giving adequate attention to collection and reporting on the use of a broad range of non-wood products, including quantities gathered and consumed, ownership rights and their importance to rural and indigenous communities; (iii) The systematic collection and reporting of information on the source and use of wood fuels; and (iv) The provision of timely, useful and comparable data on prices of wood and non-wood products as well as their substitutes. 	<p>Work Programme Element 4.2: Criteria and Indicators for SFM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2.1 Improvement of Pan-European Indicators for SFM 4.2.2 Towards Harmonising Data Collection and Reporting Systems 	<p>Work of the MCPFE on Criteria and Indicators for SFM aims to improve existing pan-European indicators on SFM, to explore possibilities to harmonise forest-related data collection and reporting systems in Europe and to elaborate a common pan-European reporting format for national reports. Further development of indicators also includes to improve those indicators measuring non-wood products derived from forests. The efforts undertaken by the MPCFE regarding harmonisation of forest-related data collection and reporting aim to facilitate data collection on European forests and to further increase quality and comparability of the collected data.</p>
<p>122. The Forum further encourages countries, including through international cooperation, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Promote policies, as needed, to meet increasing demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services, through sustainable forest management, including, where appropriate, planted forests and trees outside forests, and work towards an internationally agreed definition of planted forests; 		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 121-122)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(b) Recognize the role of the private sector, where appropriate, in producing forest products and services. This role may need to be supported within a framework of policies, incentives and regulations, such as secure land tenure and appropriate tax policies to help ensure the improved management of forests and sustained production of a wide range of goods and services;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.1: Rural Development 2.2.1 Rural Development Concept and Forest Policy in Europe 2.1.2 Contribution of Forests and Forestry to Rural Development in Europe Work</p> <p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.1 Valuation of Goods and Services</p>	<p>In its work on rural development the MCPFE highlights the role of the private sector in contributing to the development of rural areas, including the provision of forest products and services.</p> <p>The efforts of the MCPFE regarding the valuation of forest goods and services could provide a basis for further political decision. Furthermore, the MCPFE promotes the inclusion of the results of the assessment and valuation into national economic and natural resource accounting systems.</p>
<p>(c) Incorporate the supply of fuelwood and wood energy as well as efficient wood energy technologies as a crucial part of policy and planning exercises within the forestry, agriculture and energy sectors, and develop pilot studies to assess more accurately the impacts of fuelwood collection on trees and forests;</p>		
<p>(d) Develop and implement policies designed to promote sustainable production of wood and non-wood forest goods and services that reflect a wide range of values, and to ensure that the benefits of commercialization of wood and non-wood forest goods and services contribute to improved management of forests and are equitably distributed to the people who protect and provide them;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.1 Valuation of Goods and Services</p>	<p>See comments proposal § 7 (c) above.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 121-122)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(e) Review policies that have a direct effect on the price of forest products and of their substitutes, initiate studies on market behaviour, when appropriate, and recognize that appropriate prices can encourage and support sustainable forest management while discouraging overuse, waste, excess and inefficient manufacturing;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.3 Wood and Substitutes in Relation to Other Sectors</p>	<p>In contributing to the implementation of the MCPFE Work Programme, UN/ECE has published a study on "The Competitive Climate for Wood Products and Paper Packaging". Furthermore, UN/ECE is planning a seminar on "Strategies to stimulate and promote the sound use of wood and other forest-based products as environmentally friendly and renewable materials" (tentatively September 2001).</p>
<p>(f) Undertake studies on the cost and benefits of using renewable wood and non-wood forest products, as opposed to non-renewable substitutes.</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.2: Renewable Resources – Goods and Services 2.2.3 Wood and Substitutes in Relation to Other Sectors</p>	<p>See comment proposal § 7 (e) above.</p>

8. Assessment, monitoring and rehabilitation of forest cover in environmentally critical areas (§§ 128-129)

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-129)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
128. The Forum recalled the IPF proposals for action relevant to this programme element (in particular, E/CN.17/1997/12, para. 46 (a)-(f).		
129. The Forum: (a) Encouraged countries and relevant international organizations and major groups to cooperate and coordinate activities concerning forests and trees in environmentally critical areas, and to contribute to more systematic collection, analysis and dissemination of information, including social and economic data;	Strasbourg Resolutions, notably S1: European Network on Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems S3: Decentralised European Data Bank on Forest Fires Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management	The MCPFE contributes to co-ordinated activities and systematic collection, analysis and dissemination of information through data collection activities carried out in the follow-up of the Strasbourg Resolutions, notably S1 and S3, as well as on the Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for SFM.
(b) Urged countries to place rehabilitation and sustainable management of forests and trees in environmentally critical areas as a higher priority on national development agendas within the context of national forest programmes, as appropriate;		
(c) Encouraged countries, in particular countries with low forest cover, to use planted forests and other means, including trees outside forests, in agroforestry, silvipastoral and analog forestry systems (forest management systems that seek to mimic natural forests in rehabilitation of degraded land), giving special consideration to using native species, where appropriate, as options for rehabilitating degraded lands and, where possible, as a basis for re-establishing natural forests;		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 128-129)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(d) Urged countries to engage in raising awareness of the ecological, social, cultural and economic roles that planted and natural forests might fulfil in the rehabilitation and sustainable management of forests in environmentally critical areas;</p>		
<p>(e) Further urged international organizations and donor countries to strengthen their support to and collaboration with international programmes, including through the provision of financial resources and the transfer of environmentally sound technologies as set out in chapters 33 and 34 of Agenda 21 and through conventions directed to fragile ecosystems, in particular concerning the role of forests, other wooded lands and trees in the Convention to Combat Desertification and Agenda 21, chapters 12 and 13, which address the concerns of the poorer communities.</p>		

E. Forest-related work of international and regional organizations and under existing instruments (§§ 139-144)

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 139-144)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>139. The Forum called upon all interested parties, including the governing bodies of relevant international and regional organizations and instruments, to:</p> <p>(a) Identify practical means for mobilizing their diverse strengths and capabilities to support country-level efforts in implementing the proposals for action adopted by IPF, taking into account the need to enhance the active participation of all parties concerned;</p>	Lisbon General Declaration	<p>At the Third Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests the ministers responsible for forests in Europe committed themselves to <i>“take national as well as co-operative actions towards the implementation of the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS) concerning the proposals for action agreed at the ad-hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and contributing to the work of the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests under the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD/IFF)”</i>.</p>
<p>(b) Foster synergies among different international and regional organizations and instruments, and encourage their active participation in and contribution to international forest policy dialogue, with due consideration to the Forest Principles, chapter 11 of Agenda 21 and the IPF/Forum proposals for action;</p>	Lisbon General Declaration	See comment § 10 (a) above.
<p>(c) Clarify the respective roles and work to be carried out by international and regional organizations and instruments with respect to the forest-related programmes of action of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and its follow-up.</p>	Lisbon General Declaration	See comment § 10 (a) above.

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 139-144)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>140. The Forum called upon Governments to:</p> <p>(a) Utilize, as appropriate, the expertise provided by international and regional organizations and instruments in the formulation of their national forest programmes, in particular to better integrate cross-sectoral linkages and the social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainable forest management into national policies;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 4.1: National Forest Programmes</p>	<p>In the follow-up of the Lisbon Conference the participants of the MCPFE emphasised the importance of a co-operative and co-ordinated approach to the issue of National Forest Programmes at a pan-European level. In its work on NFPs so far the MCPFE succeeded in developing a common understanding of NFPs in the pan-European context and in identifying principles and elements of NFPs. It was agreed that the elements and principles for NFPs as identified by the IPF would be relevant for Europe. Inter-sectoral and holistic approaches were seen as one distinctive characteristic of NFPs.</p>
<p>(b) Establish and strengthen, as appropriate, effective national arrangements to provide coordinated and effective guidance to multilateral organizations.</p>		
<p>141. The Forum called upon the secretariats of the Task Force member organizations to:</p> <p>(a) Inform their governing bodies about the progress and outcome of the IPF/Forum process so as to strengthen their forest-related activities and their inter-agency cooperation in this regard;</p>		

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 139-144)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>(b) Explore and develop the potential for institutional synergies with other partners, especially with regional development banks, regional commissions and other regional intergovernmental bodies, non-governmental organizations, other international organizations and private sector institutions;</p>		
<p>(c) Cooperate towards developing a comprehensive Directory of forest-related international and regional organizations and instruments engaged in forest-related activities, including their mandates, missions, organizational structures, programmes, activities, personnel and budget, as well as information on collaborative forest-related work and activities of organizations and instruments. The Directory should be updated on a regular basis. FAO, in cooperation with other member organizations of the Task Force, could have a leading role in this task.</p>		
<p>142. The Forum called upon Governments to provide guidance to the governing bodies of international and regional organizations and instruments, and to encourage non-governmental organizations to cooperate in:</p> <p>(a) Implementing activities to increase public awareness of the direct and indirect benefits derived from forests, at national, subregional, regional and global levels;</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 1.1: Public Relations</p> <p>Lisbon Resolution L2: Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management</p>	<p>The activities of the MCPFE on “Public Relations” aim to provide information on the achievements of the MCPFE to the interested public, also communicating the manifold benefits derived from forests.</p> <p>Furthermore, comprehensive data on forests have also been collected through the Temperate and Boreal Forest Resource Assessment 2000 (TBFRA-2000) with regard to most of the quantitative pan-European indicators for SFM.</p>

IFF Proposals for Action (§§ 139-144)	Linkage to MCPFE Work Programme	Comments
<p>143. The Forum called upon relevant international and regional organizations and instruments to consider, in their relevant policies and programmes, the needs and requirements of developing countries and countries with economies in transition, with special attention to low forest cover countries.</p>	<p>Work Programme Element 2.4 : Countries in Transition</p>	<p>In the follow-up of Helsinki Resolution H3 a multitude of bilateral and multilateral actions and projects have been carried out, responding to important needs of CEECs. In its Work Programme, the MCPFE has underlined the importance of continuing these activities. As part of the Work Programme, an international workshop on “Forests and Forestry in Central and Eastern European Countries – The Transition Process and Challenges Ahead” will be convened by the government of Poland in co-operation with UN-ECE/FAO and the Liaison Unit Vienna in September 2001. The workshop will review the developments in the transition process and try to identify ways and means to effectively ensure sustainable forest management in the future.</p>
<p>144. The Forum urged international and regional organizations and governing bodies of instruments to support forest programmes and to integrate forest-related aspects in programmes aimed at poverty alleviation, decreasing population pressures, promoting food security and promoting environmental awareness.</p>		