

Implementation of Proposals for Action Agreed by

PREFACE

The study is based on voluntary national reports from 74 countries, representing 70% of forests in the world. Readers are cautioned to be careful in generalizing and drawing inferences based on the study. Some may argue that governments are not willing to give a full and frank account of all the difficulties they face, such as continuing deforestation on a massive scale, and their reports can be viewed by the cynic as self-congratulatory propaganda. While there may be an element of truth in this, it is not a universal truth.

These issues do, however, prompt us to ask some fundamental questions. How credible is a self-assessment? Is there willingness among Member States for third-party assessments? Will the UN Forum on Forests commission its own fact-finding studies, exploring all sources of information, in addition to national reports? While voluntary national reporting is useful, an external review can help gain a more objective view of problems and opportunities for countries. Such reports will have greater credibility with donors and could be a useful tool to facilitate implementation, attract funding and support investment.

Credibility and transparency are essential to make the UNFF a robust and effective forum. I would also like to put forth the following additional questions to the readers to muse over:

- How open and inclusive should the Forum aim to be, particularly in the context of criticisms from civil society organizations about its lack of openness?
- How should the Forum address emerging issues and challenges such as:
 - forest governance both at local/landscape and global levels,
 - internal conflict, peace-building and forest nexus,
 - streamlining forests with broader development agenda,
 - invasive species, pests, diseases, forest fire and forest health, and
 - cross-sectoral issues, including reconciling specific provisions related to forests in other legally-binding instruments (LBIs) such as UNFCCC, UNCCD, CBD, CITES, ITTA, as well as regional instruments.

Implementation of Proposals for Action Agreed by Intergovernmental
Panel on Forests and by Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IPF/IFF)
Action for Sustainable Forest Management

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	7
2.	Formulation and implementation of national forest programmes	10
3.	Maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs	14
4.	Combating deforestation and forest degradation.....	17
5.	Rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, and the promotion of natural and planted forests.....	23
6.	Forest health and productivity.....	29
7.	Economic aspects of forests.....	31
8.	Promoting public participation.....	37
9.	Social and cultural aspects of forests.....	43
10.	Traditional forest-related knowledge	52
11.	Forest-related scientific knowledge	55
12.	Forest conservation and protection of unique types of forest and fragile ecosystems	59
13.	Rehabilitation and conservation strategies for countries with low forest cover.	64
14.	International trade and sustainable forest management	68
15.	Financial resources	72
16.	International cooperation in capacity-building, and access to and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management.....	75
17.	Monitoring, assessment and reporting, and concepts, terminology and definitions	82
18.	Criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management.....	84
19.	Evaluation of progress by the <i>ad hoc</i> Expert group on parameters	86
20.	Conclusions	90
Annex I	Abbreviations	94
Annex II	Sources of information	97

Acknowledgement

This paper is largely based on information supplied in voluntary reports to UNFF and the work of those responsible for preparing these reports is gratefully acknowledged. It is hoped that the global overview presented in this paper will provide interesting and useful feedback to countries. Special thanks go to David Henderson-Howat, who, as a consultant to the UNFF Secretariat, was the main author of this paper.

1. Introduction

Background

The purpose of this paper is to give an account of actions for sustainable forest management (SFM¹), based largely on voluntary C18iortssusbmite8 Tc 0 n
f f
f

according to a number of thematic elements. These elements were considered at the second, third and fourth sessions of UNFF, as substantive themes, as common items (such as promoting public participation), or as means of implementation. This paper uses these thematic elements, set out below, as chapter headings.

- Formulation and implementation of national forest programmes
- Maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs
- CombaTD /F0 11.27schap

2003 and 2004, respectively). In addition, as part of the 2005 review of the international arrangement on forests, member States, CPF members and other relevant organizations and forest-related processes were invited to submit voluntary reports on the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action to the fifth session of UNFF, and to respond to voluntary questionnaires about the effectiveness of the arrangement. Where relevant, information from questionnaire responses is also referred to in this paper.

For the third and subsequent sessions of UNFF, the secretariat issued *Guidelines and a Suggested Format for Voluntary National Reports*⁴. These *Guidelines* invited respondents to provide information in their voluntary reports on activities or initiatives undertaken since 1997, progress made, constraints encountered, lessons learned, and issues that had emerged, as well as relevant information related to means of implementation (financing, transfer of environmentally sound technologies and capacity-building). Where appropriate, the *Guidelines* subdivided the thematic elements, and these sub-divisions are used as sub-headings in this paper.

In total, 74 countries submitted reports and/or questionnaire responses to UNFF. Their geographical distribution is shown below:

Countries submitting voluntary reports and/or questionnaire responses

Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe	Latin America & Caribbean	Western Europe & other	C
--------	------	----------------	---------------------------	------------------------	---

These countries include those of all sizes, all levels of forest cover and all stages of development. In total, they account for about 70% of global forest cover. Annex II lists these countries, together with the CPF members and other relevant organizations and forest-related processes that submitted reports and/or questionnaire responses; it also lists the Reports of the Secretary-General that drew upon these primary sources. Where it makes sense do so, this paper groups examples from different countries on a regional basis; but this practice is not necessarily followed if, for example, it makes better sense to present examples in a thematic way.

This paper attempts to convey the essence and richness of the original submissions by quoting actions referred to by particular countries and organizations. Material from other reports (such as those of country- and organization-led initiatives held in support of UNFF) is included where it was quoted in these submissions. A comprehensive account of these country- and organization-led initiatives is, however, outside the scope of this paper, which focuses on the action taken by countries, rather than the international dialogue that helped to stimulate such action.

2. Formulation and implementation of national forest programmes

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on the:

“development and implementation of your national forest programme or similar national policy framework for forests”.

The conclusions of the report of the IPF on its fourth session⁵ outline the general concept of nfps and set out their agreed general attributes and principles. Nfps include a wide range of approaches for the achievement of SFM; they should be based on national sovereignty, specific country conditions and national legislation, and should be consistent with

⁵ see E/CN.17/1997/12, paragraphs 8-17

national, subnational or local policies and strategies and, as appropriate, international agreements.

The reports demonstrated that substantial and significant work has been done in many countries to put in place nfp processes that are in line with the general definition and broad principles defined by IPF/IFF. A survey, carried out by FAO in 1998-99, showed that 104 countries were already implementing nfps, and a further 34 countries were at a the stage of planning the development of an nfp. In their voluntary national reports, 44 countries explicitly stated that the IPF/IFF proposals for action were taken into account when formulating their nfps, or similar frameworks. A survey of nfps in Europe⁶ revealed that the full value of the nfp process is increasingly being recognized. CPF members have facilitated nfps in a number of important ways, including through the National Forest Programme Facility and PROFD /IFF. A sia15 0 TD -0.0/F225 Tf -0.1c 0.1875

noted that its nfp is in harmony with the Central American Forest Strategy, and a number of countries in eastern Europe referred to policy adjustments associated with their accession to the EU.

Linkages with policy and planning processes in other, related, sectors are also important. Reports highlighted cross-references between nfps and national action plans relating to other MEAs, such as CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC, as well as PRSPs, and emphasised the need to clarify the relationship between the forest sector and other sectors, such as agriculture, energy and environment. To take one example from many, the report from Malawi explained that the following policy frameworks and strategies have recognised the value of forests: the National Forestry Programme (2001), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2004), UNCCD Country Reports and Action Plans, the Malawi National Strategy for Sustainable Development and the Environmental Policy. As pointed out by Burkina Faso, this multiplicity of plans and programmes gives rise to a complex institutional landscape which can make coordination difficult, especially where national capacity and/or resources are limited.

Where responsibility for forests lies at the sub-national level, the approach taken to nfps may vary within a country. For example, in Belgium, Flanders has a Long-Term Strategic Plan and an Action Plan for forests, while Wallonia deals with forest-related issues in its Environmental Plan for Sustainable Development. Some countries have arrangements for internal coordination. In Canada, there is a coalition of forestry ministers from the provinces and territories that promotes voluntary implementation of Canada's national forest strategy through provincial and territorial strategies. Malaysia has a National Forest Council, chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister, where Federal and State Governments meet to discuss forest-related issues. In Senegal, the process of planning has been decentralized since 1999 and so regional forest action plans are drawn up on the basis of actions defined by rural communities, within the context of national policies on forests, environment and poverty reduction. Meanwhile, Spain has a Forest Plan

which provides a national framework for the forest plans of the different autonomous communities.⁸

Several countries explained their approach to setting goals and targets. In India, (another country where forest policy and planning is a concurrent responsibility of the central government and state governments), there is a goal of increasing forest/tree cover to 33 percent over 20 years, with forests being treated primarily as environmental and social resources and only secondarily as a commercial resource. Sweden has started a consultation process for quantifiable targets to help clarify forest policy; most of the interim targets relate to 2010 and examples include a 40% increase in the amount of dead hardwood left in the forest (to enhance biological diversity), a halving of the level of unsatisfactory regenerations, and the establishment of agreements between the forest administration and 80% of municipalities regarding the long term forest management of urban woods. The Swiss nfp includes 12 quantified objectives for the year 2015 and 100 prioritised measures.

Countries often face serious challenges in implementing nfps. For example, in Benin, there is a need to overcome the problems posed by an inadequate institutional framework. The report from Finland noted, in relation to its international development cooperation activities, that adequate time must be allowed for effective participation, and that there is a need to recognise that finance for implementation must come from other stakeholders and not only the government. The report from Serbia and Montenegro explained that the extended period of political instability and constant changes at the governmental level have made planning for the future very difficult.

One of the benefits of nfps is to help secure stronger political commitment to forests. For example, in Colombia, some of the nfp goals are now included in the Government's National Development Plan. Finland also referred to evidence of strengthened political commitment and associated budget support since the launch of the nfp, adding, in the

⁸ A country-led initiative on

plans to combat desertification etc.) that collectively address the full range of forest values”.

Cross-sectoral collaboration and cooperation is important, and the maintenance of forest cover to satisfy present and future needs can only be achieved by taking account of, often complex, linkages with wider economic, social and environmental interests, including the needs of those whose livelihoods depend upon forests. One example of this, drawn from El Salvador, is the importance of linkages with energy strategy: fuelwood accounts for about 50% of energy needs, but it is in increasingly short supply and the option of promoting the use of propane gas has major implications in terms of economics, infrastructure and distribution networks.

It is, however, clear from the reports, that harmonising policy frameworks is not always easy, especially where forests have relatively little direct economic and political importance to the country. Sometimes harmonisation is achieved where forests are integrated into ministries that also have responsibility for other sectors, such as agriculture, 9re, 9rn5,5ag

4. Combating deforestation and forest degradation

Understanding the causes of deforestation and forest degradation

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“preparing diagnostic studies to analyse historical and underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation, including processes outside the forest sector”.

Despite some positive trends, the FRA published in 2000, revealed continuing forest loss in all regions except Europe and North America. During the 1990's, the net loss in global forest cover averaged 9.4 million hectares per year. Underlying causes of deforestation are complex and varied. For example, pressures to use forest land for agriculture and grazing, and to exploit forest products at an unsustainable level, are often rooted in poverty. There were particular examples of this in reports from

- Sudan attributed deforestation to consumption of forest products and expansion of agricultural land area;
- Underlying causes of deforestation in Togo include conversion of land to grow cacao, coffee and cotton; mismanagement of existing forests; fire and grazing by cattle.

Examples from Asia included:

- Identification, in Cambodia, of the direct causes of deforestation or degradation of forests as improper management in concession areas, illegal logging, improper management in protected areas and non-concession areas, conversion of forestlands for agricultural purposes, and limited reforestation activities. The report also recognised that poverty in rural communities is one of the underlying causes of these problems;
- Studies in the Islamic Republic of Iran that highlighted the significance of factors outside the forest sector, including population growth and increased needs for agricultural land, urbanization and the expansion of industry. In recent years, legislation has restricted land use change;
- Studies in Thailand that attributed deforestation to increased demand for agricultural land and to commercial logging. It was noted that a national logging ban had removed pressure on natural forests and that increased use of natural gas had reduced demand for fuelwood and charcoal.

Examples from Latin America included:

- The significance, in El Salvador, of high population density, associated with pressure on agricultural land in a relatively small country;
- Recognition by Peru that agricultural migration, which is a principal cause of deforestation, is itself a consequence of poverty.

factors were drought, overgrazing, misuse of forests, forest fires and the high demand for fuelwood and charcoal to meet basic energy needs; drought and fire are still major factors affecting deforestation. In the nineteenth century, population growth in Serbia and Montenegro caused deforestation and subsequent erosion in mountainous areas: this was associated with serious flooding and, as a result, felling controls were introduced. IUFRO Research Groups have been examining the main driving forces and underlying factors of forest degradation in Central Europe over the last 400 years.

Deforestation is not a problem in every country. For example, the report from Luxembourg explained how historical overexploitation, caused by demand for agricultural land and charcoal, has given way to forest restoration over the past 150 years. In Switzerland, the forest area is increasing and there is no need to take action to promote further increase in the forest area.

Another perspective is provided in the report from the Republic of Korea, which explained that some deforestation is unavoidable. This is because forests cover 64% of the land area and some of this land is required for roads, residential sites, construction sites and agriculture. The report noted, however, the rate of deforestation is now decreasing and some degraded and fallow land is being rehabilitated.

Addressing the causes of deforestation and forest degradation

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“formulating and implementing national policies and strategies, through an open and participatory process, for addressing the underlying causes of deforestation”.

In addition to the development and implementation of nfps (and similar frameworks), action taken by countries to address the causes of deforestation and forest degradation has included the use of regulation; cross-sectoral measures and the promotion of forest restoration (which is discussed in chapter 5).

make further progress in combating deforestation and forest degradation, it is clear that further efforts are needed to address underlying causes, to improve cross-sectoral coordination with other sectors (such as agriculture) and to strengthen means of implementation.

CPF members have facilitated action in a number of important ways. For example, ITTO's Objective 2000 supports countries as they move towards achieving exports of tropical timber and timber products from sustainably managed forests. FAO, in collaboration with ITTO, is preparing a set of guidelines on *Best Practices for Better Law Compliance in the Forest Sector* for decision makers to follow in reducing illegal operations in the sector. FAO is also helping to develop practical guidelines for responsible forest management and environmentally sound harvesting codes. The CBD expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity, adopted in 2002, includes activities geared towards reducing deforestation and forest degradation. GEF provides funds through its OP 15, which addresses SFM in the wider context of sustainable land management and includes support to sustainable agriculture and rangeland management.

Raising awareness of the importance of deforestation and forest degradation

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“raising awareness of the importance of issues related to deforestation and forest degradation and the multiple values of forests”.

The reports showed that if deforestation and forest degradation policies are to be effective, people need to understand the consequences of failing to take action. In Thailand, improvements in forest management have succeeded as a result of a public outcry for stronger conservation and protection: this increased social appreciation of forests is itself a consequence of natural disasters (such as land slides) attributed to deforestation and forest degradation. Finland suggested that the importance of forests should be presented in terms of their potential contribution to human development and poverty reduction, since

economic and social arguments often carry more weight than purely environmental arguments.

Common approaches to awareness raising include publications, articles in newspapers and magazines, documentary films, television and radio, and teaching about environmental issues and the consequences of forest degradation in schools. Cambodia has a National Tree Planting Day⁹, as well as using community forest management, extension activities, cooperation with NGOs, videos and the media to raise awareness. Congo uses a National Day of the Tree to promote SFM. Cyprus mentioned the value of lectures to soldiers in the army and other organized groups about the benefits of the forests and the need for protection. Ireland has a NeighbourWood Scheme to encourage the development of community woodlands in and around town and cities. Malawi held a National Forestry Week in 2004 during which all stakeholders were encouraged to help rehabilitate degraded forests through tree planting and proper forest management practices. In Senegal, projects promoting the availability of micro-finance are used as an opportunity to help raise awareness about the insidious impact of forest degradation. Sudan uses forestry extension to increase public awareness through village committees and forestry associations; there is also an annual Arbor Day, when seedlings are distributed free of charge. In the USA, NGOs and land trusts are educating landowners about the use of conservation easements and other mechanisms for keeping family forests intact.

“promoting the creation of new forest resources through plantations and on recognizing their role in the rehabilitation of degraded lands and forests in environmentally critical areas”.

Action taken by countries has included forest restoration through natural regeneration, the establishment of plantations and agroforestry projects. Several examples were given to illustrate the importance of plantations in reducing the pressure on natural forests, without causing undesirable social or environmental side-effects. China has recognised that it cannot meet its long-term needs for timber merely by depending on natural forest and timber imports. Thus, fast growing and high yielding plantations are being developed to meet the domestic demand and to release the pressure on natural forests. New Zealand has long-recognized that the felling of natural forests, for agricultural development and to meet wood needs, would eventually lead to the clearance of all accessible areas, and accordingly took action to establish its present substantial plantation-based wood resource. In the Russia Federation’s mixed forest zone, the basic method of restoration is through plantation establishment, although natural means are used for forest restoration in taiga forests. Spain is promoting fast-growing plantations on land that will produce quality wood to reduce the deficit in wood production and to help the economy of depressed rural areas.

Other countries mentioned some of the difficulties they face in establishing plantations. One of the challenges is the supply of suitable

lack of funds and other resources for planting or for tending existing plantations; poor access due to deterioration in the condition of roads; illegal felling; drought; fire and grazing. Emphasis is now being given to models of forestry development that focus on individual ownership, rather than larger communal activities, where uncertainty regarding the allocation of future benefits can act against people's willingness to protect and manage the resource;

- Work with NGOs, in Malawi, to involve communities in SFM and agroforestry projects; support for private sector participation in forest resource creation and encouragement for agricultural estates to plant trees to meet their future wood needs on site; creation of new forest resources through distribution and sale of tree seed (for example, to village level communities, schools and associations); and reforestation of public land by the forestry department. Nevertheless, the rate of reforestation is still low relative to forest resource use and depletion, because it is constrained by resource availability;
- Experience, in Togo, which shows that people only engage in forest protection when they find that this is in their interest. A pilot participative project is aiming at a consensual approach towards SFM, afforestation and agroforestry.

Further examples of experiences from Asia included:

- Extension of tree planting with indigenous species in Cambodia, particularly in the areas where socio-economic, environmental and wildlife conservation is given high priority. A "Cambodia Tree Seed Project" aims to conserve endangered and rare tree species and a national gene ecological zonation has been developed as a tool for planning of gene conservation and seed use;
- Within China, there are two main forestry systems, namely, an ecological forest system and a forest industry/plantation system. Emphasis is given to the ecological system in fragile areas and in the western arid regions, which are of particular environmental

importance, with deterioration of the local ecosystems posing a threat to ecological and economic development in the lower reaches of river basins. Since 2000, GEF has contributed to a programme in western China to demonstrate integrated

planting over a five year period. Particular benefits include the promotion of cleaner water supplies a

organisations, in the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration¹⁰.

A UNFF intersessional country-led expert consultation held in New Zealand in 2003 on the ‘Role of Planted Forests in Sustainable Forest Management’ made recommendations on a range of issues to promote their role to the international community.¹¹

Meeting increasing demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“promoting policies to meet increasing demand for wood and non-wood forest products and services through sustainable forest management”.

Approaches to this issue vary widely, according to circumstances.

An important challenge in the Russian Federation is the need for investment in transport and industrial infrastructure to promote the development of forest resources which are necessary to meet increasing demand. Despite the apparent availability of forests in the Russian Federation, their industrial development is not always economically viable. Most of the processing capacity is concentrated in the European part of Russia, but the main stocks of forest are beyond the Urals where the wood processing industry is underdeveloped, except for individual regions, and their high, and increasing, costs of transport.

6. Forest health and productivity

Air pollution

The *Guidelines* stated that:

“if damage to forests from air pollution is a significant problem in your country, please provide information on recent national strategies or programmes to minimize damaging air pollution. Please indicate if your country is involved in international cooperation efforts aimed at strengthening scientific knowledge, increasing information access or reducing the impacts of long-range air pollution on forests, as well as your views on the role of enhanced cooperation at the regional and international levels to facilitate such work.”

The reports from those parts of the world where this is a significant issue, recognised that industrial emissions were the fundamental cause of damage to forests from air pollution. Air pollution was an issue of high visibility and concern when the IPF met in the 1990's and several proposals for action called for countries to adopt preventive measures to reduce air pollution, and for the international community to develop or continue to implement both national and international programmes for monitoring air pollution, and its effects on forests. The relevant IPF proposals for action have largely been implemented in some regions. For example, in Europe, where the problem has been particularly acute, measures have been taken to reduce industrial emissions. Damage to

forests has been significantly reduced, although air pollution remains a serious issue in some countries (for example, it is an important problem in Ukraine) and in particular areas subject to industrial emissions. There is a continuing need to monitor forest health and there is also concern about the potential long-

Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama are working together, with assistance from FAO, in a joint effort to reduce and to control infestation. Some countries highlighted the significance of growth in international trade, with its impact in terms of possible new introductions of potentially damaging pest and disease organisms. FAO is providing direct technical assistance to countries to help solve forest pest problems and is also compiling data for a global information system on insect pest and disease outbreaks and their impact on forests.

In relation to abiotic factors, an example of storm damage was given in the report from Sweden, where storms in late 1999 caused comprehensive damage to over five million cubic metres of timber. In the USA, fire management has become a major focus of forest policy and, in 2002, Federal Agencies spent US\$ 1.6 billion fighting forest fires. Several reports noted that raising public awareness about the harmful effects of fires is a critical factor in mobilizing rural communities to manage fires, but added that funding is often inadequate for these

“the valuation of forest goods and services (this may include, among other things, the development and use of new valuation methodologies, valuation of a wider range of goods and services, and policy decisions that reflect a more comprehensive assessment of forest values)”.

Forests provide numerous goods and services, both market and non-market, which have significant economic importance and their accurate valuation is essential for sustainable resource management. Nevertheless, formal statistics relating to the role of forests in the economy often underestimate the full value of forest goods and services. Examples of these underestimates are given in reports from Burundi (where forest products account for only 2% of official GDP despite the fact that wood is the source of over 95% of energy needs) and Senegal (where official statistics state that the contribution of the forest sector to the national economy is around 1%, but according to other surveys forest resources affect the survival of 54% of the, most disadvantaged, people in the country). Underestimates such as these have serious consequences and can prevent the potential contribution of forest-related outputs from being fully reflected in national policies, such as PRSPs.

One reason for failing to recognise the full value of forest goods and services is lack of data. Where forest-related economic activity, such as the collection of firewood and the use of NTFPs, takes place in the informal sector, relevant information is not collected. Another problem is that of valuing non-market outputs, which include the environmental benefits of forests. Techniques for valuing non-market outputs, such as contingent valuation, hedonic pricing and the travel-cost methods, have limitations and it can be difficult to make practical use of the results. Nevertheless, there are examples of progress. Austria referred to a scheme for Integrated Environmental and Economic Accounting for Forests developed by a EUROSTAT Task Force on Forest Accounting and to a subsequent project assessing its applicability in Austria. Japan explained that a valuation of multiple forest functions has been carried out by the Science Council of Japan. Recognising methodological limitations, it put the following values (at ¥ 1000 = US\$ 9) on the country's forests: absorbing carbon dioxide (replacement cost) US\$ 11 billion/year; substituting TD 0.0-123f70.8Tj Tc 4 Tc 2.rests deTc 0.9fby a EUR(and r

billion/year; preventing loss of top soil (replacement cost) US\$ 76 billion/year; ameliorating flooding (replacement cost) US\$ 58 billion/year; conserving headwater resources (replacement cost) US\$ 79 billion/year; purifying water (replacement cost) US\$ 132 billion/year; health and recreation household expenditures (travel cost) US\$ 20 billion/year. Spain also outlined a methodology that takes account of productive, recreational and environmental aspects of forests to provide a comprehensive assessment of their economic value and is used as a planning tool.

Recognition of the value of non-market outputs by governments is essentially a political decision, influenced by socio-economic changes. For example, in the Republic of Korea it is understood that the recreational value of forests will increase with changes in working patterns (such as the introduction of a five day week) and urbanization. Mauritius has recognised that the increasing demand for recreation and eco-tourism activities and the importance of forests as water catchment areas, will shift emphasis towards these outputs, rather than timber production. Recent research in Croatia confirmed that the importance to

example, the scope for developing ecotourism businesses depends upon the inherent attractiveness of the area as a tourist destination. In general, charging for environmental services is only possible where people can be excluded, or prevented from enjoying the benefit, if they do not pay: this may prove to be impossible, either for practical reasons or for legal reasons (for instance, where people have a legal right of access to forests for recreation).

Market data and information on forest products

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“the amount, scope, or quality of market data and information for wood and non-wood forest products and their substitutes”.

While some countries have well-developed systems for gathering and disseminating market data, others explained that they have limited capacity for such work. Where this data is available, it is usually derived from a number of sources, including trade and industry statistics (such as information from Customs authorities), specific market surveys, forest inventories, routine returns (for example on wood harvesting and hunting) and agricultural statistics. In general, information about NTFPs is less comprehensive or reliable than information relating to wood and wood products. Furthermore, data is often less reliable in relation to small-scale transactions, particularly in the informal economy, and expert assessments or surveys are needed to estimate the size and value of these transactions. There are also data limitations that arise from constraints imposed for reasons of commercial confidentiality; from the incentive to misrepresent forest revenues in official returns; and from the difficulty of disaggregating data relating to multi-national companies in the forest products industry.

hunting9D -0.0896 TcTj 2un Tc 0 T49

Products with statistical data on basic forest products, including production and trade, for all countries and territories of the world. It is important that relevant information is accessible to those who need it. Thus, for example, Pakistan highlighted the need to make market information available to tree farmers; and Romania is establishing a Forest Sector Business Information Centre to provide information on markets for wood and non wood forest products, on promotion opportunities, and on relevant technological developments.

Using economic and policy instruments to facilitate progress towards SFM

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on the:

“use of economic and policy instruments to facilitate progress towards sustainable forest management (these may include improved tax policies and forest revenue collection systems)”.

The rationale for specific economic and policy instruments in particular countries depends upon priorities for SFM and, as priorities change, instruments may be applied differently. For example, in Norway, support has shifted away from incentives for afforestation, towards encouraging environmental measures and promoting the use of wood as an environmentally friendly material. In some countries these priorities are determined at local or regional level, and instruments are adjusted accordingly.

Different instruments may be required to promote SFM in publicly owned, as opposed to private, forests. In publicly owned forests, the focus is on rent capture and subsequent allocation of financial surpluses generated by forests. Inadequate rent capture can act as a perverse incentive, encouraging overexploitation, and cause a loss in potential government revenues. A number of countries, including Cambodia, Canada, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Peru, the Philippines, the Russian Federation and Senegal, explained how they have developed (or are developing) market-based systems for establishing rates of payment, tightening up on the collection of revenues and taking account of environmental considerations in both

the setting of payments and the application of contractual conditions to concessions. Policies about how much revenue should be reinvested in SFM and how much should be distributed to public authorities at national or local level vary, and change over time, reflecting political priorities. The Russian Federation, noted that reductions in forest revenues are making it harder to invest in SFM. Public ownership of forests can itself be an explicit instrument used to secure desired outputs and in these circumstances it may be accepted that public forests do not generate a financial surplus but require subsidy.

Instruments used to promote SFM in private forests include regulation; financial incentives, such as grants and low interest loans; tax allowances; and provision of services (for instance, aerial liming, fertilizing and fire control in the Czech Republic, and management for environmental purposes in Greece). These instruments may be interrelated, for example where financial incentives and tax allowances are conditional upon agreeing management plans with forest authorities and meeting prescribed norms in relation to SFM. While some countries offer forest owners financial compensation for income foregone in meeting the requirements of SFM, other countries regard at least some of those requirements as legal obligations that owners must meet without compensation. The extent to which owners should be expected to internalise such costs is a political decision. For example, the Polish forest policy provides for a system of paying owners for non-market environmental benefits and there is tax relief for certain national heritage forests. Some countries noted that forest owners are increasing political pressure for such payments because they are finding it difficult to meet the costs of achieving higher environmental standards against a background of falling wood prices.

An important point emerging from the reports is that policies aimed at promoting afforestation must take account of the value of agricultural land, which may be inflated by agricultural subsidies. This underlines the importance of effective cross-sectoral policy integration. In developing its forest bond scheme, El Salvador recognised the importance of land for agriculture and so provided incentives promoting afforestation through agroforestry systems that combined the growing of coffee with the establishment of trees for timber production.

8. Promoting public participation

Guidelines invited countries to provide information on:

“mechanisms or initiatives to facilitate stakeholder participation, including indigenous and local communities, in forest sector planning, decision-making and/or forest management”.

The *Guidelines* also invited countries to provide information on:

“integrating local and indigenous communities in SFM programmes, particularly as regards ... participation in decision making regarding the management of forests”.

Action has been taken to promote stakeholder participation at various levels: in policy making; through preparation of codes of practice; through local consultation on forest management decisions in respect of

A number of countries explained that they have constitutional mechanisms for public participation that apply to all areas of policy. These include, for example, the role of parliamentary bodies in enacting legislation and approving government policies, as well as the publication by governments of consultation documents. Several reports referred to

not transfer property rights. Following these transfers, forest degradation has reduced with less clearing of forest, less unauthorised felling and fewer wild fires;

- The forestry department in Malawi has recently devolved some of its key responsibilities to District Assemblies and local communities, which are legally incorporated as key players in SFM through village natural resources management committees. A major challenge is the large number of these committees, compared with the low capacity of Government and NGO extension services to support the participatory forest management planning process. Malawi is building the capacity of field forestry extension staff and communities, to help match community needs with forest resource use;
- Action is being taken to give local communities greater responsibilities for forest management in Senegal. Constraints include lack of technical expertise; insufficient transfer to local communities of the resources necessary to fulfil their responsibilities; the risk that certain local councillors use their position for personal gain; resistance from central bodies to the transfer of competencies to the local communities; and competition with sectors for resources at the local level. Nevertheless, this decentralization has had positive effects in the development of the forest resources, making communities more aware of the full value of these resources and making it easier to manage conflicts;
- In Sudan, management plans for some forests have integrated local communities in SFM.

Examples of action in Asia included:

- Some 300-400 community forestry initiatives in Cambodia. Local communities that participate in the community forestry projects may enter into agreements with the government that offer the right to manage and use forest land in or near their villages, for their own benefit, for up to 15 years, within the framework of approved management plans. The *Code of*

Practice for Forest Harvesting makes provision for local communities to participate in decision-making with regard to forest concessions;

- Involvement of village communities and voluntary agencies in forest management through India's Joint Forest Management programme, which has now been implemented in 61,000 villages, with 85,000 committees, covering more than 17 million hectares of forests. The social functions of forests are very important. Forest fringe villages, where forests are inseparably linked with livelihoods, comprise 28% of all villages in India. The supply of fuelwood, fodder and small timber, such as house building material, for those living in and around the forests is treated as a first charge on forest produce.
- The opening up of national forests to allow the public to practice forest tending and to establish recreational forests in the Republic of Korea;
- Participatory forest programmes in Nepal, aimed at releasing the energy and resources of individuals through Forest Users Groups and Community Development Groups. Local people are allowed to use national forests to fulfil their basic livelihood needs. Through its community forestry programme, the Government is seeking to enhance capacity and promote democratization in users' groups because, when decision-making power is given to users who depend on the forestry resources in question, the decisions made have a good chance of being implemented;
- A recent Forest Ordinance, in Pakistan, that provides a legal basis for the involvement of local communities in the management of the forest areas. Joint Forest Management has devolved decision making processes to the local level, but much needs to be done to bring indigenous people into the national planning process.

Examples of action in Latin America included:

- A project in Guatemala to strengthen community forests through building capacity and developing technical expertise;
- Extension of a pilot project aimed at promoting community based SFM to all forest regions of Mexico. Criteria for the selection of the communities are their social condition, their level of organization and experience in forest management and the proportion of indigenous people (the pilot project involved about 1.7 million indigenous people);
- Encouraging the participation of rural settlers in the management of the forests in Venezuela through an integrated community forest management programme. Legislation provides for

“strengthening the role of women in SFM, including through capacity building and greater participation in community-based forest management”.

There are many countries where rural women are the major caretakers and users of forests, and where forest-related activities, including firewood collection, demand a great deal of women’s time and labour. On the other hand, women’s knowledge of forest resources has often been ignored or undermined, owing to lack of voice, unfavourable land-tenure structures, restrictive cultural practices, low levels of education and limited access to credit. For example, in Lesotho, women head approximately 30% of all households and undertake a substantial proportion of agricultural and forestry activities, coping with the difficulties posed by a seriously degraded environment; nevertheless, many women in Lesotho only have access to land through user rights granted to their husbands and they have to circumvent this through strategies such as share cropping and illegal leasing.

In a number of countries, the constitution, or other legislation, guarantees equal rights to men and women and, in some cases, specifies gender representation on public bodies. There are also wider national initiatives promoting equal opportunities for women; for example in Luxembourg the “Gender mainstream” strategy supports social measures to create true equal opportunity rather than simply relying upon legal equality. Action to strengthen the role of women in SFM has included the development of gender-sensitive community forestry programmes which have achieved high levels of participation by women and have generated lessons for other projects. An example of how this is being driven forward is given by Finland, where gender equality is an important goal in international development policy, and all forestry cooperation funded with ODA is geared to address gender issues.

Countries also reported on policies and initiatives to strengthen the role of women in their forest sector and end the view that forestry is a male profession. For example, there is deliberate posting of women into decision-making roles at all levels in the forest administration in Malawi. Reports from Australia, Austria, Norway, Slovakia and the USA all referred to associations of women foresters that are working to

strengthen the influence of women in the forest sector. Guatemala gave an example of a women's association that is a development partnership promoting sustainable management of natural resources (mainly forests)

16% of forest workers are women (while most are active in tree-planting work, some operate high-performance machinery); and in Switzerland 1.7% of the forest work force are women.

Representatives of women's groups highlighted the Second World Wide Symposium *Gender and Forestry: Challenges to Sustainable Livelihoods and Forestry Management*¹², where the focus was on women's and men's access to forest resources, as a means of improving livelihoods. A central issue was to ensure a balance between economic development, social development, and natural forest resource protection as independent and naturally reinforcing and crosscutting components of sustainable development. The symposium also attempted to promote new systems that could empower women forest dwellers to participate effectively in processes of good governance in the forestry industry.

Customary and traditional rights and privileges of indigenous and local communities

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“integrating local and indigenous communities in SFM programmes, particularly as regards recognition and respect of the customary and traditional rights and privileges of indigenous and local communities...”

Community involvement in forest management is strengthened where there is a recognition of these rights and privileges, so that indigenous and local communities can make decisions on the management of forest resources and the sharing of benefits. There are, however, considerable differences in approach according to local circumstances and cultural backgrounds.

Two examples reported from Africa were:

¹² held on 1-10 August 2004 in Kilimanjaro, Tanzania, as an organization-led initiative in support of UNFF.

- The requirement, in the Forest Code of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, for the rights of local communities to be investigated as a prerequisite before issuing forest concessions; prior consultation with neighbouring populations is also required. The report also explained that, traditionally, local populations consider that the forests belong to them, as an inheritance from their ancestors, and so local communities may acquire free forest concessions on their ancestral land;
- Recognition, in programmes for SFM in South Africa, of customary and traditional rights and privileges of indigenous and local communities; legislation exempts communities with customary and traditional rights from regulatory controls over state forests.

Examples reported from Asia were:

- A new forestry law in Cambodia that secures customary user rights for local communities, living within or near permanent forest reserves, to collect wood and NTFPs for their household consumption;
- In Thailand, the constitution recognizes the rights of traditional communities in relation to natural resources management and this has led to initiatives promoting community participation in forest management.

Examples reported from Latin America were:

- The granting of concessions, in Guyana, to communities in order to allow them to benefit from their hereditary rights; in addition, special consideration is given to indigenous communities in the forest land allocation process;
- In Peru, indigenous communities do not need permission to make use of natural resources for non-commercial purposes within their territories;

- Legislation in Venezuela gives indigenous communities rights to manage forests in territories traditionally occupied by them. The

- In recent years, federally recognized American Indian and Alaska Native tribes in the USA have achieved a high degree of autonomy and self-determination in the management of their forests.

Other reports explain in more general terms that traditional user rights, such as access for recreation, the picking of wild berries and mushrooms and collection of deadwood, are recognised by law. Some reports also refer to less tangible aspects of customary and traditional rights. For example, in Benin sacred forests have a special importance in providing spiritual safeguards for people's lives; forests also occupy a central place in the cultural life of some of the peoples in Senegal.

Securing land tenure for local and indigenous communities

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“integrating local and indigenous communities in SFM programmes, particularly as regards ... the attainment of secure land tenure arrangements...”ment ofser rightsents

Hungarian Forestry Association to secure land tenure arrangements for some 3000 communities.

In some countries, land rights are characterized by the coexistence of the traditional regime with modern written codes. For example, in Benin, the law grants user rights to give local people access to deadwood, food, medicinal products and grazing, subject to the requirements of forest management plans; nevertheless, despite the influence of the customary rules, there are frequent local conflicts over land. In Lesotho, land traditionally belongs to the people as a whole and is held by the King on behalf of the nation, with village councils allocating land to individuals; while, forest legislation grants ownership of trees to those who plant them and the forestry ministry may grant ownership of trees and forests for a period of time, subject to conditions relating to SFM. Land reform in South Africa has provided for the restitution of land rights that were dispossessed during the apartheid era and the recognition of informal but, as yet, unrecorded rights to land; the forestry programme seeks to incorporate the new landowners into participatory forestry projects, and legal entities (such as Trusts) have been established to give legal status to traditional structures.

education and training, which is regarded as the primary tool for technology transfer, and added that there are also specific programmes to help indigenous people practice SFM. Venezuela highlighted the more general importance of the strengthening general education for indigenous peoples.

In Guatemala, capacity building is a central part of the community forestry strategy. Its objectives include helping communities to strengthen their organisation, their ability to make joint decisions and the interaction and distribution of power between communities and other interest groups. The programme also provides technical and financial assistance to help communities understand, plan, execute and evaluate actions required for SFM. In Greece, incentives are available (under the EU Rural Development Regulation) for local cooperatives of forest workers to modernise their equipment.

resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of their utilization. Some explained that *ex-situ* and *in-situ* conservation of forest genetic resources may require different approaches.

Venezuela explained that indigenous organizations have an active role in discussions and the drafting of laws relating to the rights of indigenous villages and local communities with regard to access to the genetic resources and the equitable distribution of the benefits. Peru referred to relevant provisions within the common regime on intellectual property of the Andean Community of Nations.

Some countries pointed out that private forest owners have legal rights to benefit from the use of forest genetic resources and associated intellectual property rights. Reference was also made to the European Forest Genetic Resources Programme and to legislation concerning forest reproductive materials.

10. Traditional forest-related knowledge

Inventorying, cataloguing and applying traditional forest related knowledge

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“inventorying, cataloguing, and applying traditional forest-related knowledge for sustainable forest management and promoting research on TRFK with the involvement of the knowledge holders”.

Many inventories and catalogues have been compiled by scientific institutions and by individuals with a particular interest in this subject. Ethnographic studies on NTFPs have identified previously unknown pharmacological uses of forest products. India described the documentation of traditional knowledge and the preparation of Community Biodiversity Registers at village level; these Registers are used to help to establish claims over knowledge and use of biodiversity

resources. In Thailand, over a thousand published and unpublished documents have been reviewed in a recent study; there are also four literary botanical gardens, which collect and interpret trees referred to in Thai novels and legends. Venezuela has inventories of plants and animals used by different ethnic groups, including lists of Amazonian plants for medicinal and magical use, nutritional plants, plants used as food containers, fruits, pigments, oils, resins and fibres.

Reports noted that there is much, potentially very beneficial, TRFK that has not been captured. In Cambodia where indigenous and local communities have historically depended on forest resources, but there has been little research on indigenous forest knowledge. TRFK in the Republic of Korea is rapidly being lost through industrialisation and urbanisation, although such knowledge can still be found where forests are managed by temples and by observing small-scale gathering of NTFPs. UNEP is supporting a project on *Biodiversity Conservation and Integration of Traditional Knowledge on Medicinal Plants in National Primary Health Care Policy in Central America and the Caribbean*, with the aim of integrating the conservation and management of medicinal plants with rational use of traditional remedies in primary health care.

Examples of applying TRFK to SFM include the use of fire as a management tool and techniques for improving the utilisation and conservation of soil and water resources. In China, valuable references for SFM are found in systematic summaries of traditional knowledge from different regions that are published in articles on community and participatory forestry and on Chinese traditional medicine. Senegal explained that wood working craftsmen take care only to cut trees in accordance with their own codes of practice and that local populations have detailed knowledge of the multiple-uses of different trees, including fruit production; resentment is caused when the forest authorities give permission for the trees to be felled in violation of these traditional codes.

Some reports noted that indigenous peoples may be reluctant to share traditional knowledge with others. Reasons for this reluctance include the concern that harm may come from misuse, fear of the knowledge being corrupted when used by individuals not immersed in the associated culture and potential loss of intellectual property rights. In some

countries, contemporary interest in gathering of NTFPs has spawned large scale commercial ventures that raise questions of ecological, economic and social sustainability.

Forest management by indigenous peoples may be based on a combination of Western science and traditional knowledge. In this context, a number of European countries pointed out that their long tradition of scientifically based forest management has gradually incorporated TRFK, amalgamating it with technical knowledge to develop sound approaches to silviculture and other aspects of SFM. The report from Croatia suggested that forest-related educational curricula should recognise the importance of such traditional knowledge.

Supporting the application of intellectual property rights and/or other protection regimes for traditional forest related knowledge, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“supporting the application of intellectual property rights and/or other protection regimes for traditional forest-related knowledge, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of traditional forest-related knowledge, innovations and practices”.

Several countries referred to their general legislative frameworks for the protection of intellectual property. Some also explained more detailed arrangements that apply with respect to traditional knowledge. In India, patent applications must disclose the source of origin of biological material used in the invention and an electronic data base of documented traditional knowledge relating to the use of medicinal and other plants is under preparation; this data base could be used by patent offices throughout the world for searches to prevent bio-piracy. Malaysia noted that existing patent laws cannot necessarily provide adequate protection for indigenous knowledge and that a speci

understanding founded on custom, culture and protocol) asserts group ownership of intellectual property rights in knowledge or the expression of thought that is passed down from one generation to another. A Maori claim relating to this knowledge is currently under consideration. The government is working with Maori experts to develop a framework for the retention and promotion of traditional knowledge, with the intellectual property remaining as the property of the particular local Maori community. Formal recognition of traditional areas in the Philippines, where 12 million people (belonging to 110 major ethno-linguistic groups) claim about 5 million hectares of forest, includes the protection and respect for indigenous knowledge systems and practices.

The protection of TRFK, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of such knowledge, is under active discussion within various international forums. These include the World Intellectual Property Organization's Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore as well as the CBD. A CBD working group is addressing the implementation of Article 8 (j) of the Convention, which deals with this matter. TRFK is also a component of the CBD expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity, adopted by the COP in 2002. In 2004 the COP adopted a number of decisions relating to the Akwé: Kon voluntary guidelines¹³ and to the consideration of *sui generis* systems for the protection of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices.

11. Forest-related scientific knowledge

Dissemination of scientific knowledge and s

capacity and mobilizing funding for national and regional research institutions and networks”.

Action to disseminate scientific knowledge includes professional education and training (at all levels and at all stages in careers); meetings (such as conferences, seminars and workshops); the use of printed material (including journals, research bulletins, manuals, textbooks, yearbooks, information leaflets and magazines); and extension work. All these traditional methods of dissemination remain important for students, forest and environment professionals, private and community forest owners and the wider interested public. In some countries, call centres offer an advisory service that complements more traditional extension activities; with either approach, an essential skill is the ability to “translate” scientific results into useful information for practitioners.

Increasing use is also being made of electronic publication and the internet. The Global Forest Information Service (GFIS¹⁴), hosted by the IUFRO Secretariat, is an internet gateway that provides access to information on forest resources at a global scale; this currently holds more than 120,000 metadata records and will include maps, datasets, web resources, journal articles, books and other resources related to forests. Other examples include the European Virtual Faculty of Forestry¹⁵; the Italian Academy of Forest Sciences’ eforum for the development of SFM Standards relevant to Appennine and Mediterranean Forests¹⁶; Pakistan’s *allforesters* mailing list; and the Swiss information service on natural resources in international cooperation¹⁷.

It is important to identify responsibilities for disseminating information, and updating it in the light of scientific and technical developments, and changing socio-economic conditions and views about the primary role of forests. Plans for dissemination should form an integral part of all research programmes. In addition, research institutions and government departments, professional bodies, trade associations and NGOs may all have a key role in the effective dissemination of information. Sweden referred to the importance of providing information (for example through

¹⁴ The website is <http://www.gfis.net/>.

¹⁵ The website is <http://gis.joensuu.fi/viefor>

¹⁶ The website is <http://www.aisf.it/sam/index.htm>

¹⁷ The website is <http://www.intercooperation.ch/inforest/>

educational work and publications) for people who work outside the forest sector, but wish to participate actively in discussions about forests.

Forest-related scientific research capacity varies very considerably between countries. Some have a wide range of research institutes and academic establishments, while others (particularly a number of developing countries) explained that their research capacity is small or minimal. The most commonly cited sources of research funding are national governments (and the EU), international donors and the voluntary sector. The CPF focal agencies for forest-related scientific knowledge, CIFOR, ICRAF and IUFRO, are themselves important scientific institutions or organizations.

Many reports, from both developed and developing countries, referred to a general decline in funding for forest-related scientific research. While at least one country (Norway) funds research and development by means of a levy drawn from all harvested wood sales, others (such as Spain) noted that, apart from the paper and board industry, the industrial sector has limited capacity to fund major research, concentrating instead on development projects that make use of existing research findings. Benin and Malawi stressed the problem of under-funding. Guatemala explained that the forest research strategy had helped identify research priorities, which were being funded through a number of ITTO projects. In Uruguay, the private sector has an increasing role in funding research and determining research priorities.

The need for collaboration and international cooperation was stressed in a number of reports. This is necessary to prevent duplication and friction between research institutions. It can also bring together complementary sources of funding for integrated projects: for example some funders may focus on high quality basic research while others focus on near-market research and technology transfer. Other reports mentioned the value, particularly where research capacity is limited, of drawing upon research findings developed at the regional level and applying them to the local context.

Enhancing interaction between scientific research and policy processes

- The area of gazetted forest reserves in Malawi has increased by 20% over the past five years, but effective management is becoming more difficult as a result of encroachment and illegal exploitation of forest resources, especially in the densely populated areas where land holdings average less than one

Developing and implementing partnership mechanisms for forest conservation areas

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“developing and implementing partnership mechanisms to engage forest owners, private sector, indigenous people and local communities in the planning and management of forest conservation areas and developing and implementing a range of innovative mechanisms for financing and encouraging forest conservation”.

Partnership mechanisms include consultation prior to the designation of forest conservation areas; mechanisms for stakeholder participation in the development of management plans; joint management; the establishment conservation land trusts (for example where NGOs acquire and/or manage forest conservation areas); and public-private contracts that pay landowners to carry out conservation work and/or compensate them for losses incurred due to restrictions on forest management activities in protected areas that are in private ownership.

Examples of innovative mechanisms that were given in the reports included:

- The provision, in Congo, of alternative hunting areas, for example in peripheral zones, to prevent conflict with local communities;
- The introduction, by Finland, of a system of competitive tendering, whereby landowners offer to rent or sell ecologically valuable areas of forest to the authorities at an agreed price. Tenders are selected according to financial costs and ecological benefits. Finland also referred to a case where a paper company had donated land to the state to allow for the establishment of a National Park.

•

- Algeria explained that the distinction between production forests and protection forests is not well defined: production forests in good ecological condition also contribute to protection and conservation;
- Bulgaria highlighted the importance of effective measures to protect environmentally critical areas from fire;
- The nfp in Cyprus includes provisions for the protection and restoration of degraded land, watershed protection, the maintenance of ecosystems and biodiversity and the conservation of the flora and fauna. High priority has been given in the Rural Development Plan to protect and restore woodlands and single trees in environmental critical areas or of important ecological value;
-

- Poland highlighted the importance of fragile mountain forest ecosystems and the threats these areas face from air pollution, weather conditions, insects and fungi;
- Russia explained that the concept of SFM has removed forestry from a narrow industrial framework, broadening it to embrace the ecosystem approach. Accordingly, there has been substantive revision in forest policy, shifting from a simple focus on exploitation of forest resources to an ecosystem approach. This balances the needs of forest resource use and economic efficiency with the long-term conserva

“expanding forested area, establishing and managing plantations to enhance production of forest goods and services, while avoiding the replacement of natural ecosystems, and recognizing the role of imports in satisfying the needs for forest products and services; promoting the regeneration and restoration of degraded forest areas including through partnerships and building capacities to promote effective participation in decision making, and development and transfer of environmentally sound technologies; improving the efficiency of international cooperation to support the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and building capacity to monitor forest resources.”

The precise definition of a low forest cover country is not conclusively agreed upon yet, but a threshold of less than 10 per cent of land area covered by forest is commonly adopted, giving a total of 67 low forest cover countries. In 1999, an expert meeting in the Islamic Republic of Iran¹⁸ helped to provide guidance on the issues that are most important for forest management in low forest cover countries and led to the launch of the Tehran Process.

Action taken has included afforestation programmes and the implementation of detailed operational guidelines aimed at conserving the protective functions of forests in areas of low forest cover. Mechanisms have included direct government intervention; the use of regulation and codes of practice (for example in relation to felling); financial support (including low interest loans); and provision of information.

Reports from particular countries stated that:

¹⁸ This was the International Expert Meeting on *Special Needs and Requirements of Developing Countries with Low Forest Cover and Unique Types of Forests* held in Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran on 4-8 October 1999 as a country-led initiative in support of the programme of work of IFF

- Algeria began implementing the national reforestation plan in 2000; this includes the establishment of a green belt (*barrage vert*) of three million hectares, which is 1,200 kilometres long and 25 kilometres wide. The plan has also led to useful research

forest nurseries. Eucalyptus plantations are now restricted to degraded and saline lands;

- The primary goal of the government of the Russian Federation in areas of low forest cover is the maintenance of natural functions of forests, including water-security and anti-erosion. Since 1997, the Forest Code has included substantive provisions relating to water-security and protective functions of forests, with detailed regulations relating to felling: ecological criteria, which assess changes in the forest environment following felling, help determine appropriate felling systems and harvesting methods;
- In Sudan, plantations have been established using both

the global project on land degradation assessment. UNEP and the UNCCD secretariat are collaborating on a project aimed at providing standardized information and methodologies for land degradation assessment in drylands.

14. International trade and sustainable forest management

Efforts to reduce negative impacts of trade

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“efforts to reduce negative impacts of trade”.

International trade is regulated through WTO by a well-established legal framework,

certification system based on the particular situation in Japan, where there is a high proportion of planted forests and small-scale ownership.

Certification can help exporting countries to demonstrate that their forest products come from sustainably managed sources. For example, New Zealand regards certification as an important step for future marketing, as it will provide customers with an assurance that New Zealand forest management is ecologically sound and socially beneficial, while maintaining economic viability. Several reports noted the importance of commitments by major retailers to sell wood and wood products with particular certification labels.

Although certification is voluntary, some countries have introduced measures to encourage it. For example, in Guatemala, certification by the Forest Stewardship Council is an explicit requirement of concession contracts and, in Peru, financial incentives are offered to encourage certification.

Concern was expressed about potential variation in the way in which standards are applied by auditors; the need for mutual recognition of the different certification schemes; and the costs of certification. These costs include the process of certifying the forests themselves, the costs of chain of custody certification and the costs of work needed to address the issues raised during the certification process Tw (e) -1erent certific5rl Tc 0.925

ITTO has been taking the lead on trade issues within the CPF and continues to promote international trade in tropical timber, including trade from sustainably managed sources. IUCN, CIFOR, ITTO and FAO, have also been actively involved in FLEG/FLEGT processes.

15. Financial resources

The *Guidelines* did not include any separate sections on financial resources, but countries were invited to provide relevant information on finance (as well as other means of implementation) in relation to implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

There is evidence, from many reports, of financial problems arising because revenue from forest products is not matching increased costs, including in particular those associated with the delivery of non-

Notwithstanding these developments, many developing countries and

- GEF, as the financial mechanism for the CBD, the UNCCD and the UNFCCC, had (as of June 2004) provided US\$ 822 million in support of projects that address threats to forests through its OP on Forest Ecosystems; this funding leveraged nearly US \$1.2 billion in co-financing. Additional financing is directed to forest conservation through other GEF biodiversity OPs, such as the OP on Mountain Ecosystems which has received US\$ 440 million of GEF support. Through OP 15, Sustainable Land Management, the GEF is providing approximately US\$ 177 million to support forest management;
- ITTO continues to mobilize financial resources for the sustainable management of tropical forests through its policy work and project activities. Since its establishment in late 1986, ITTO has mobilized some US\$ 250 million to fund more than 500 projects and activities through its own mechanisms, including the ITTO Special Account and the Bali Partnership Fund;
- Since the adoption of its revised forest strategy, World Bank Group lending for forest management, conservation and development has grown from US\$ 61 million in 2001 to an estimated US\$ 619 million for 2005.

Funding from NGOs and other voluntary sources, such as trust funds and foundations, is also recognised, although some countries stated that their *ad hoc* nature can make it difficult to plan for effective use. ODA is often
chann6311.25 5

16. International cooperation in capacity-building, and access to and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

“international cooperation, including development and implementation of partnerships”.

Many countries are actively engaged in international processes, including those associated with UNFF itself and (at the regional level) partnerships such as the Amazonian Cooperation Treaty Organisation; the Andean Community of Nations; the Asia Forest Partnership; ASEAN; the Baltic 21 process; the Central American Alliance for Sustainable Development; the Convention of Central American Forests; MCPFE; SADC and other C&I processes.

•

effect of afforestation on carbon sequestration, and nurseries; cooperation with New Zealand; and a bilateral memorandum of understanding between China and Sweden;

- In Colombia, cooperation with Germany on promotion and financing SFM, and certification; with the Netherlands on forest inventory; and with the USA on mechanisms for formulating and implementing forest policy;
- In Guyana, cooperation with Canada and the UK on research, conservation and development in the Iwokrama Reserve (370,000 hectares of tropical forest with equal areas for wilderness preservation and sustainable utilization); with the Netherlands on reduced impact logging; and with the NGO Conservation International on research and biodiversity conservation;
- In Indonesia, cooperation with Finland on forest industry development;
- In the Republic of Korea, cooperation with China, Indonesia, Mongolia, Myanmar and Vietnam on restoration of degraded forest; cooperation with China and Mongolia on preventing yellow dust storms and combating desertification; and with Indonesia on combating illegal logging;
- In Lao PDR, cooperation with Finland on community forestry;
- In Lesotho, cooperation with Germany on forest development; and with Kenya on social forestry;
- In Liberia, cooperation with the USA to support post-conflict

- In Madagascar, cooperation with Germany, Switzerland and the USA on community management of state-owned forests;
- In Malaysia, cooperation with Denmark on sustainable management of peat swamp forests; with Germany on sustainable management of inland forests (including preparation of guidelines on reduced impact logging, silviculture and forest management); and with the Netherlands on sustainable management of *Gonystylus bancanus* (ramin).
- In Mexico, cooperation with Finland on preparing and implementing a Strategic Forestry Plan 2005;
- In Mozambique, cooperation with Finland on national forest inventories and integrated forest fire management;
- In Myanmar, cooperation with Japan on agro-forestry, investigating properties of herbal plants, community forestry, ecology of teak and mangrove forests and extension work; and with the USA on conservation of habitats for (eg) elephants and tigers
- In Namibia, cooperation with Finland on nfp development, national forest inventories, forest conservation, community forestry and integrated forest fire management;
- In Nepal, cooperation with Australia on community resources management and livelihoods; with Denmark on natural resource management and community forestry; with the EU on an integrated watershed management project; with Germany on the Churia forestry development project; with the Netherlands on biodiversity; with Switzerland on community forestry development; and with the UK on a livelihoods and forestry programme; with the USA on strengthening governance of natural resources;
- In Pacific Island states, cooperation with New Zealand;

- In Peru, cooperation with Finland on forest conservation and community forestry; with Germany on rural development and environmental education; with the Netherlands on combating desertification; and with the USA through debt reduction to fund tropical forest conservation;
- In the Russian Federation, cooperation with Finland on SFM and biodiversity conservation (including education of employees in forest organisations); and with Sweden on forest sector cooperation;
- In Serbia and Montenegro, cooperation with Canada on development of a public relations strategy and expertise; with Norway on development of the Serbian forest sector; and with Luxembourg on forest management and planning, and seed and nursery production, in Montenegro;
- Cooperation between Sweden and a number of African countries on *Lessons learned on SFM in Africa*²³;
- In Tanzania, cooperation with Denmark on agroforestry and the development of sustainable strategies for the forestry sector based on open and participatory dialogue; and with Finland on nfp development, forest conservation, community forestry and joint forest management involving rural communities in the conservation of protected forest areas;
- In Turkey, cooperation with Finland on trade in forest products and forest sector technology, on nfp implementation and to support joint commercial projects;
- Under the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, the USA has provided debt reduction to provide funds for tropical forest conservation in Panama, El Salvador, Belize, the Philippines and Bangladesh. The USA also launched the Global Conservation Program as a partnership with six leading conservation

²³ A country -

- The National Forest Programme Facility, hosted by FAO; as of September 2004, 36 countries and two sub-regional entities had received grants. FAO also supports development and implementation of nfps in 22 countries through its technical cooperation programme, and is undertaking studies on financial strategies and mechanisms to support nfps, initially focusing on Latin America;
- PROFOR, hosted by the World Bank, has been working on development and implementation of nfps in Cameroon, Costa Rica, Guyana, Malawi and Viet Nam;
- UNDP has supported decentralization and local governance processes by addressing policy reforms and development planning, promoting effective legal frameworks and mobilizing resources for use at regional and local levels. UNDP's Capacity 2015 programme is providing support to developing countries in capacity-building related to socio-economic development;
- UNEP, in partnership with FAO and IUCN, is providing support for developing countries on technical issues related to the UNFCCC modalities for forest projects under the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol;
- A World Bank loan for Romania's Forest Development Programme; this is strengthening the private sector and forest-related institutions so that they will be able to benefit from EU Prog2at

17. Monitoring, assessment and reporting, and concepts, terminology and definitions

The *Guidelines* invited countries to provide information on:

- Switzerland makes a version of its data made available to the general public in the form of a “walk through the Swiss forest” website²⁴.

On the other hand, a significant number of countries reported difficulties with monitoring, assessment and reporting. For example:

- In Algeria, the work of the land register of forests has not progressed well because the National Land Register has other priorities. The national forest inventory suffers from lack of expertise in inventory methodology and tree mensuration and a lack of technical aid;
- The exact situation regarding forests in Benin remains unknown. Some studies have been carried out under particular projects, but the National Centre of Remote Sensing and Monitoring of Forest Cover suffers from staffing difficulties which make it difficult to take advantage of investments in terms of equipment and training. Another problem is that this Centre has been privatised, which makes it difficult to give priority to public work;
- In relation to its international development cooperation activities, Finland noted that national forest inventories are often constrained by lack of technical capacity and funding. Despite use of modern remote sensing technologies, the inventories always involve significant, and time-consuming, fieldwork;
- Information on forest resources in Malawi is generally outdated, based on the land map drawn up in 1992; forest plantation resource/stock maps are also old and require updating;
- Slovakia explained that the traditional Central and Eastern European method of inventory is not compatible with modern () T

CPF has a Task Force on Streamlining Forest-related Reporting and is also closely involved in work to harmonize forest-related definitions. IUFRO has recently developed an online multilingual glossary of carbon-related forest terminology²⁵. Several CPF members have collaborated with other organisations (such as EUROSTAT and the UN Statistical Office) in the further development of the Joint Forest Statistics Questionnaire to enhance accuracy and reliability of information on forest products production and trade.

FAO has recently increased its effort to build capacity for national forest assessments and to improve the forest information base. The FRA provides a comprehensive report on forest resources, their management and uses every 5-10 years. The 2005 update is building on linkages with C&I and using the seven thematic elements of SFM, acknowledged by UNFF at its 4th session, as a reporting framework. FRA has refined reporting tables and definitions in all FAO languages for the 2005 update. In the

Many countries are developing and/or implementing national C&I within the frameworks provided by the nine regional processes

C&I (at the management unit level and at national level) within the context of the Tarapoto (Amazon Basin) process.

CPF members are supporting the regional processes and promoting the development and use of C&I at the national and forest management unit

broad mandate the expert group was invited to “*Consider other outcomes of the international arrangement on forests, inter alia countries’ efforts to implement the IPF/IFF proposals for action, other expert groups, Forum country- and organization-led initiatives and previous relevant initiatives, and forest-related work undertaken by the members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests;*” ECOSOC also decided that the preparations for the ad hoc expert group meeting should include “*Compilation of the progress made and catalysts and obstacles encountered by member States and Collaborative Partnership on Forests member organizations in implementing the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests/Intergovernmental Forum on Forests proposals for action and the decisions and resolutions of sessions of the United Nations Forum on Forests;*”

Although the deliberations of almost 70 designated national experts and 60 country representatives did not result in consensus on every issue, they concluded that the creation of the IAF, including the establishment of the UNFF supported by CPF, was a considerable achievement. It was noted that there had been progress in the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and that the IAF had played an important part in this, although UNFF had a limited mandate and limited means.

It was also indicated that the progress had often been limited at the national level. The experts identified a number of catalysts and obstacles for the implementation of the proposals for action. The most recognized catalysts include:

- strengthened and secure long term political commitment;
- the increased development and implementation of national forest programmes, which are also valuable in promoting inter-sectoral cooperation;

- political recognition within some countries of the relevance of SFM;
- the process for developing and implementation of criteria and indicators for SFM;
- certification, although it was also noted that certification is a complex issue;
- partnerships, including private-sector and stakeholder participation;
- the role of the CPF and its joint and collaborative initiatives;
- country- and organization-led initiatives; and
- opportunities for exchange of experience (at Forum sessions, during intersessional activity and informally).

It became obvious however that serious obstacles hindered progress which included:

- difficulties in including forests and forest management on the political agenda;
- insufficient means of implementation, particularly the lack of financial resources. These include resources needed for national implementation of SFM and for facilitating reporting;
- policy dialogues that tend to be too far removed from action on the ground and remote from the needs of other levels (national and regional) and other stakeholders (including non-governmental organisations, business and

industry, indigenous people and local communities, and practitioners);

- a lack of time and appropriate venues for a more detailed exchange on lessons learned;
- absence of sufficient financial support from the governing bodies of CPF for collaboration and coordination in relation to forests;
-

together with their negotiated language, makes them difficult for conveying a focused message that practitioners can understand. Some experts said that it was important to raise awareness of the IPF/IFF proposals for action amongst stakeholders and countries and reference was made to tools for country assessment. There is a need to consider their future role, building upon the achievement of developing them, but also developing more priority objectives. This is necessary in order to develop a common understanding of core priorities that can be shared with those responsible for implementation and with those working in other sectors. It was suggested by some that SFM was more likely to enjoy political support if there was more focus on a small number of strategic goals and key priorities clearly linked to national development strategies. In addition it was also suggested by some that in a future IAF, the proposals for action should be a context rather than a focus priority for implementation.

20. Conclusions

This overview of action towards SFM is based on voluntary national reports from 74 member States representing approximately 70% of the world's forests. These reports provide a very useful insight of the major developments of the most recent years. The voluntary reports and questionnaire responses submitted to UNFF provided a basis for a detailed analytical study (available in electronic format only from the UNFF website²⁹), the Reports of the Secretary-General, and for subsequent consideration by UNFF, of the challenges and obstacles regarding implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and of future actions. It should be born in mind however that these reports do not constitute a geographically or topically systematic survey, and so

29 Review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests. Analytical study.

http://www.un.org/esa/forests/pdf/national_reports/unff5/analyticalstudydraft.pdf

great care should be taken in attempting to generalize from the main findings.

The national reports revealed uneven development across the sixteen UNFF elements offering excellent opportunity to learn from successes, and sometimes from problems and shortcomings. Formulation and implementation of national forest programmes, promotion of public participation, as well as criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management are identified by most of the responding countries as areas where good results and considerable development was reached. At the other end of the spectrum financial resources and international capacity building and access to and transfer of environmentally sound technologies were mentioned as areas with the greatest challenges remained. Experiences with other UNFF elements vary largely by country, but undoubtedly help in identifying main focuses of future actions.

The reports largely support the main findings of the ad hoc Expert Group on Parameters regarding the catalysts for, and obstacles to, the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action³⁰, noted in the previous section.

A fundamental challenge for the future is to ensure that society places a proper value on forests, reflecting their non-market, public good, outputs as well as financial returns. Other priorities identified in the reports include the need to develop effective institutional frameworks, with good governance; to safeguard the rights of those people whose daily livelihoods depend on forests; and to establish stronger cross-sectoral links with other parts of national policy processes (such as PRSPs).

The questionnaire responses suggest that the international arrangement has done a good deal of useful work, against a background of many competing priorities on the international agenda, but that its full potential is yet to be realised.

³⁰ Discussed in more detail in the paragraphs 19-33 of the Report of the Secretary General to the 5th session of UNFF on *Review of progress and consideration of future actions* (E/CN.18/2005/8).

In order to fully utilise this potential, the information contained in these reports suggests that the future work of the international arrangement on forests should be shaped so that it could:

- Secure political commitment. To achieve this, it must be clear to decision-makers, and the people they represent, why SFM is relevant to the broader international development goals, including those set out in the Millennium Declaration;
- Strengthen the horizontal cross-sectoral linkages between the forest sector and other sectors, at the global, regional, national and local levels. This will require analysis, and networking to develop linkages between forest policies and wider social, economic and environmental policies; the identification and examination of emerging issues; and making better use of the UNFF's position to contribute to debates taking place in other international forums;
- Strengthen the vertical linkages between forest policy development and dialogue at the global, regional, national and local levels. This will help in the identification of emerging issues and will also help to ensure more rapid transfer of knowledge and experience. Well thought out country-led initiatives and regional meetings can be particularly valuable in this respect;
- Create a stronger enabling environment for the implementation

de216 (-) Tj 4.5 62 TD -0.1732 Tc 1ronmemere id transfer of

e0 T7525 Tf 0.075 e2.75 T6Tc (-) Tj 3.75975 TD T7 62 TDc 3.omic and el pasougfication and
onal f42n;

•

- Improve monitoring, assessment and reporting through processes that are perceived as worthwhile and relevant to countries' needs. C&I can provide a sound framework, provided that countries have the capacity to collate the necessary information.

The five years review of the IAF provides the international forest community with an excellent opportunity to refine the main functions of the arrangement and decide on future priorities, institutional and working modalities so that it can more effectively address the above issues while remaining adaptive and responsive to emerging new challenges.

GEF	Global Environment Facility*
GFIS	Global Forest Information System
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre*
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
ISO	International Organisation for Standardisation
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organisation*
IUCN	World Conservation Union*
IUFRO	International Union of Forestry Research Organizations*
MCPFE	Ministerial Conferences on the Protection of Forests in Europe
MEA	Multi-lateral Environmental Agreement
nfp	national forest programme
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NTFP	non-timber forest products
ODA	official development assistance
OP	GEF Operational Program
PROFOR	Program on Forests (hosted by the World Bank)
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SADC	NTFP 5CCommunity TD-0.5 AfrOrgn D875 Tw (5CCommunity TD- TD0.1

TRFK	traditional forest-related knowledge
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification*
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme*
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme*
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests*
WTO	World Trade Organisation

* CPF members are CIFOR , FAO, ITTO, IUFRO, UNDP, UNEP, ICRAF, the World Bank, IUCN and the Secretariats of the CBD, GEF, UNFCCC, UNCCD and the UNFF.

Annex II Sources of information

1. Voluntary reports to UNFF and questionnaire responses

<u>Name of Respondent</u>	<u>Voluntary reports to UNFF sessions:</u>				<u>Questionnaire</u>
	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>	<u>4th</u>	<u>5th</u>	<u>5th</u>
Algeria		v	v	v	
Australia			v		
Austria	v	v	v	v	
Belgium	v			v	
Benin				v	
Bulgaria				v	v
Burkina Faso				v	
Burundi		v			
Cambodia	v	v		v	
Canada		v	v	v	v
China		v			
Colombia		v		v	v
Congo				v	v
Congo, Democratic Republic of			v		
Croatia		v	v	v	
Cyprus			v	v	
Czech Republic		v		v	
Denmark			v	v	
El Salvador			v	v	
Finland	v	v	v	v	
France				v	
Germany	v	v	v	v	
Greece				v	
Guatemala				v	
Guyana			v		
Honduras			v		
Hungary		v	v	v	v
India		v		v	
Indonesia			v	v	
Iran, Islamic Republic of	v			v	
Ireland			v		
Italy		v	v	v	
Japan	v	v	v		

<u>Name of Respondent</u>	<u>Voluntary reports to UNFF sessions:</u>				<u>Questionnaire</u>
	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>	<u>4th</u>	<u>5th</u>	<u>response:</u> <u>5th</u>
Kenya		v			
Korea, Democratic People's Republic of		v			
Korea, Republic of		v	v	v	v
Lebanon		v		v	
Lesotho		v		v	
Lithuania			v	v	v
Luxembourg				v	v
Madagascar				v	
Malawi				v	
Malaysia		v		v	v
Mauritius	v	v		v	
Mexico	v	v	v	v	
Myanmar				v	v
Nepal		v			
Netherlands		v		v	
New Zealand	v	v	v	v	
Norway	v	v	v	v	v
Pakistan		v		v	
Peru			v	v	
Philippines		v		v	
Poland		v	v	v	
Portugal	v	v			
Romania				v	v
Russian Federation			v	v	v
Senegal				v	v
Serbia & Montenegro		v	v	v	
Slovakia				v	
South Africa			v		
Spain		v		v	
Sudan			v	v	
Sweden	v	v	v	v	
Switzerland		v	v	v	v
Thailand				v	
Togo				v	v
Turkey			v	v	v
UK	v	v	v		
USA		v	v	v	
Ukraine		v	v		
Uruguay			v		

Name of Respondent Voluntary reports to UNFF sessions: Questionnaire response

2. Reports of the Secretary-General

Review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forest (E/CN.18/2005/6)

Linkages between forests and the internationally agreed development goals, including those contained in the Millennium Declaration (E/CN.18/2005/7)

Review of progress and consideration of future actions (E/CN.18/2005/8)

Traditional Forest-related Knowledge (E/CN.18/2004/7)

Social and Cultural Aspects of Forests (E/CN.18/2004/8)

Forest-Related Scientific Knowledge (E/CN.18/2004/9)

Monitoring, assessment and reporting, concepts, terminology and definitions (E/CN.18/2004/10)

Criteria and Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management (E/CN.18/2004/11)

Forest Health and Productivity (E/CN.18/2003/5)

Economic Aspects of Forests (E/CN.18/2003/7)

Maintaining Forest Cover to Meet Present and Future Needs (E/CN.18/2003/8)

Rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands and the promotion of natural and planted forests. (E/CN.18/2002/3)

National forest programmes. (E/CN.18/2002/4)

Trade and sustainable forest management aspects of the 2003-2005 Millennium Development Goals (E/CN.18/2005/9)

Forest conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems. (E/CN.18/2002/9)