



Timber Committee

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe



European Forestry Commission

Food and Agricultural Organization

UNECE / FAO Team of Specialists on
“Monitoring sustainable forest management”

REPORT
of the meeting of the Team of Specialists

Geneva, Switzerland, 16-17 December 2010

Item 1. Opening and welcome, arrangements for conducting the meeting, adoption of the Provisional agenda.

Simon Gillam opened the third meeting of the Team of Specialists, presenting the main objectives of the meeting. Meeting participants were welcomed by Ms. Paola Deda (UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section) and Messer. Arne Ivar Sletnes (Forest Europe) and Orjan Jonsson (FAO) who informed them about the relevance the ToS work, FRA (FAO) and regional activities (Laison Unit Oslo) have on sustainable forest management.

Ms. Paola Deda introduced herself as new Chief of the Forestry and Timber section. Ms. Deda highlighted the importance of the State of Europe’s Forest publication as a key component to better understand and further contribute to sustainable Forest Management in Europe. Ms. Deda thanked all contributors who brought in knowledge and expertise to compile data and analyze information during the process of writing the report. Ms. Deda mentioned the International Year of Forests 2011 as a major opportunity to promote and share knowledge of European Forests. Ms. Deda emphasized the United Nations’ role to provide a forum for sharing information and expertise would be fully endorsed through the dissemination of the State of Europe’s Forests 2011. The secretariat will ensure the final product is made available widely and shared all levels, including policy level. Ms. Deda also thanks Roman Michalak for his tremendous efforts in coordinating the process are really appreciated and his work is fully endorsed by everyone. (The SoEF is a significant background document – political attention to it.)

Mr. Arne Ivar Sletnes started by briefing participants on the Expert Level Meeting (ELM), which took place at the United Nations on 14-15 December 2010. He explained the ELM was an important step in the preparation of the next Ministerial Conference which will be held on 11-14 June 2010 in Oslo, Norway at which the State of Forests report will be launched. The Ministerial Conference will also be a great occasion to celebrate the International Year of Forests. Forest Europe appreciates all the efforts that have been put into this publication.

Mr. Orjan Jonsson briefed participants on the outcome of the FRA process which report was launched during COFO in October 2010. Mr. Jonsson realized that the work of the Team of

Specialists was quite timely and that many contributors to the FRA process were also involved in the State of Europe's process. Since many of the participants take part in both processes, he encouraged ToS members to share lessons learnt from both FRA and SoEFs processes and to hear stories on what went well and what went wrong.

GFRA was launched at COFO, 900 people involved in the process including XXX NC. Now making the data available in a more user friendly interface. RSSurvey expected to be published late 2011 and also working with the validation workshop.

Mr. Roman Michalak presented the state of development of the report on quantitative indicators, including the next steps and forthcoming deadlines while Mr. Aljoscha Requardt presented the preliminary results of the enquiry on qualitative indicators and next steps.

Both Mssrs. Michalak and Requardt shared their appreciation of the hard work and expertise of all contributors, ranging from secretariats to ToS members to National Correspondents. Both agreed that the data and information provided have improved since the last report.

2. Presentation of the method of work and organization of the meeting

Mr. Michalak briefed participants on meeting procedures and explained group work.

3. Presentation and discussion of the first draft of the State of Forest's 2011

Lead Authors gave a short introduction to the first 4 topic areas Criteria 1, 2 and 4 as well as on European Forest Types.

Develop:

Claude Vidal

Goran Stahl

Sweden

Indicator 1.3

To add

Develop:

Michael Koehl introduced criterion 2 .

Soil condition, 2.3.Defoliation – add key findings (status and trends) 2.4 Forest damages

1.2 % of forest area damaged in Europe (exc. RU)

Damage

Indicator 2.4 Forest damage trends 1990-2000-2005

Trends: largest increase – forest area

Develop:

Criterion 3 – Annemarie Bastrup-Birk

Presented the work of Marco Marchetti and herself – composed of 5 indicators.

Increment and fellings

23 countries in total reported on net annual increment and fellings.

The volume of annual felling is still less than annual increment so it is a sign of good sustainability.

The overall value of marketed roundwood =16.5 billion Euros (check slide on indicator 3.2: Roundwood)

Trends 1990-2010

Overall increase in marketed roundwood
Total marketed removals

Indicator 3.3: non-wood goods – limited data however the total value of NWFP equals
(include amount in Euros)

3.4 Services.
Social services and recreational services.

Ind 3.5 Forest under management plans. All forest are under management plan.
Slight increase of forests covered by management plan 2000- 2010

First CCI
To include in there

Develop:

Anna Barbanti on EFT

Based on 33 responding countries

Level of responses very good on compulsory indicators 82-88 %

25-36% voluntary indicators

Completeness of data on compulsory indicators

The reporting by EFT was demanding for NC but also bring valuable information. This new info is made available by

RM asked countries to comment/work groups to share their views of future applications on EFTs.

Authors then reported from group discussions on the above mentioned Criteria and on European Forest Types.

Criterion 1:

Forest area : can it be a summary only?

The RU, it has to be a region on its own.

Display – total should be in different colours for different regions

Trends estimations – if we present trends changes, whether we include the old regions

Some of the graphics need changes or are to be skipped completely

Carbon, data, in some countries: are derived from default factors

Be careful in writing and commenting data: definition, new inventory systems.

Uneven aged forest difference btw total forest area minus even-aged forest area.

Not recommended as there are other classifications involved

Definitions different in their countries

Handling of forest roads and all type of temporary instocked forest

Uneven-aged forest vs other forest may be ok

Several countries no data on age classes and diameter distribution are available (i.e. RU, Belarus)

As well as Compiling the data for the report, get back to the old issues raised for the Vienna conference.

There is to be clearer guidance for countries to submit their data in the proper format and also improve the indicators again.

The authors should refer to the documents provided for the Vienna conference to gather their data.

European Forest Types:

Anna Barbati

Pbl of feasibility of the classification

Collect views from country on how to use the data from the report. More time needed to comment. An extra week should be made available to comment on the EFT report.

Give more time to countries to read the technical report and provide suggestions on how to further elaborate on the data.

Berit: how to deal with this in the future. In Bordeaux, a small group work on pilot reporting and advise on pilot reporting. The draft representation from the group will be presented to the ToS. A core group to give recommendations.

No final suggestion

Kt Prins asked whether the EFT report should be included in the main report.

RM. Results are interesting but EFT is a pilot reporting. FT are included but on a pilot basis.

If there is a will from countries to include these results into the main report then we will but on the basis that countries provide the report. Alternatively, we could include EFT report as an annex.

Criterion 2:

Display of the map 2.1, 2.2, 2.3.

More info on the current state

Damage:

Countries have a pbl to meet the nomenclature and what is requested by forest Europe.
Forest fires, RU reported on the area where forest fires had been damaging.

Public perception is overestimating forest fires

Deposition: add some wording

RU-

Some countries reported on forest and other wooded land but not on .

Criterion 3:

Forest management plan – sometime it was reported that there were more management plan than reported.

Increment and fellings: highlight the topic of wood energy – how much is used for wood fuel
To have a look at the intensity of felings, over-estimated as it includes mortality, illegal logging...

Report in gross annual increment instead of net annual increment

Utilization rate as an indicator for sustainability – also look at the age structure – harvest is increasing due to the age structure

Comments on non-wood foredst products: it should be explained in the text that there is a lack of data.

Takingcare in not over emphasizing on some products (i.e Xtmas trees in the north and corks in the south)

Concentrate on marketing values and the income.

KP- 3.2. wood energy

4.9. wood energy

Wood energy is already mentioned in these indicators

Each indicator is dealt with exclusively for that indicator, not to repeat

Forget Warsaw, all the data is there and has been validated.

MK: There should be made clear the difference between 3.2 and 6.9.

There is a need of guidance on data quality on indicators.

RM- there may be a need for an annex

There should be an introductory sentence on the number of country/pourcentage of countries reported.

Indicate the numbers of countries represented at the beginning of each indicators.

Indicating completeness in terms of national reporting or available information.

Proposal, for exclusive purpose of 2nd draft, to include completeness from countries on each indicators. Anything related to quality for indicators should be included.. Authors will include info on the reporting aspects of data quality for the 2nd draft.

OJ. How valid are these assements?

4. Presentation and discussion

Result tables

Database 43 094 data variable

>1500 data entries (Croatia, Estonia, Sweden, CZ and Slovakia)

Average /country 937

Comparing Soef 2007 to this one, we almost doubled the data variables.

The GFRA have ???

Analysis: 46 country reports, comments have been extracted and sorted for different reporting forms and different variables. 68 annex tables have been displayed.

Look at variable level: state analysis, trend analysis (display all the figures and then calculate annual trends) the totals for the sub regions and the regions.

OJ talked about calculated totals prepared for authors to give them a reference for writing.

Roman Michalak on SOEF's evaluation of incomplete data for status and trend assessment.

Calculations of totals that will be presented in the report.

Data coverage is better than in 2007...

For the purpose of writing the report, there is a need for information on for and for information on.....

Solutions at national level:

1st phase of the review process put stress on missing data and enhanced national correspondents to use existing information for filling data gaps

Final decision on the form of a national report belongs to a national correspondent

Data provided by a country cannot be modified or supplemented by secretariat, reviewers or authors

2nd phase of the review process

Authors reviewed delivered data and proposed changes

National correspondent decides on supplementing missing data

For sub regional and regional level, the situation is different. The solution from the consultative process:

Next to the totals for the whole Europe, we will propose totals for Europe without RU totals and for EU 27