

UNECE-FAO  
**FORESTRY AND TIMBER SECTION**

---

**Fifth (25<sup>th</sup>) meeting of the “UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on  
monitoring sustainable forest management”**

*Tromsø, Norway 22-24 May 2017*

***Report from the meeting***



*Item 1. The meeting was opened and chaired by Mr. Stein M. Tomter, the leader of the Team. Mr. Odd-Arild Finness welcomed participants on behalf of the Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research. Mr. Anssi Pekkarinen (Leader of Forest Resources Assessment) addressed the Team on behalf of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and introduced the new global forest reporting process. Mr. Roman Michalak welcomed the Team on behalf of the UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section.*

*The agenda of the meeting was adopted as proposed, without any modifications (Annex I). The list of participants is attached to this report (Annex II).*

*Item 2. Ms. Gro Hylen (the Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research) presented information about the forest and forest management in Norway and the Troms region. The presentation is available at the meeting's website.*

*Item 3. Mr Anssi Pekkarinen (FAO) presented the process, status and plans for the 2020 reporting. Mr. Örjan Jonsson (FAO) introduced the group work on the FRA reporting format. Members of the Team were provided with proposals for modification of the global questionnaire, which included substantial reduction of the number of reported variables in relation to the 2015 one, for the review. The Team was asked to indicate variables that would be covered by compulsory reporting, as well as these proposed to be reported on annual basis. Mr. Toni Strandell (Reaktor/FAO) presented the process and the prototype of the national data collection interface; the presented ideas and solutions were discussed and commented by the Team members. Presentations provided are available at the meeting's website; results of work done in subgroups and discussions are presented in the Annex III of this report.*

*Item 4. Mr. Matej Schwarz (Liaison Unit Bratislava of FOREST EUROPE) presented the initial proposals, issues and ideas for reporting on the newly introduced pan-European indicators (2.5 Forest land degradation, 4.7 Forest fragmentation, 4.10 Common bird species). Mr. Martin Moravčík (Liaison Unit Bratislava of FOREST EUROPE) presented terms, definitions and classifications for substantially modified Pan-European indicators for SFM (1.4 Forest carbon, 4.2 Regeneration, 4.3 Naturalness, 6.4 Investments in forests and forestry, and 6.10 Recreation in forests). The presentations delivered are available at the meeting's website and results of the discussion are available in the Annex IV of this report.*

*Mr. Rastislav Raši (Liaison Unit Bratislava of FOREST EUROPE) presented a roadmap on the State of Europe's Forests (SoEF) 2020 production. According to this plan, data collection on qualitative and quantitative indicators will be collected in 2018. The revised proposals for the reporting format on quantitative indicators will be presented on the FOREST EUROPE platform (<http://foresteurope.org/forestforum/communication-platform/?wpforo=signin>) for further consultation. The next version of the reporting format will be presented to the SoEF Advisory Group, at its meeting in September 2017. There is intention to release of the preliminary SoEF results well before the Ministerial Conference, to increase their impact on the preparation of the Ministerial Conference.*

*Mr. Roman Michalak (UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section) briefed the Team about the way of linking global and pan-European definitions and classifications. Following the approach applied for the previous reporting, wherever the same term is used, a global definition will be applied. In the case of divergent classifications, all effort will be made to ensure their convertibility. Furthermore, he informed the team*

*about the planned measures for coordination between the global and the pan-European data collection processes. It is intended that the data collection for both processes will be done jointly, with the engagement of the same national correspondents, reviewers and the use of the same reporting tool (as developed for FRA). A workshop for national correspondents will be organized in April 2018, in Geneva. ToS suggested the deadlines for the pan-European data collection should be fully compatible with the FRA data collection, while regional report should be published ahead of the Ministerial Conference to be held in 2020. The presentation delivered is available at the meeting's website.*

- Item 5. Mr. Roman Michalak (UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section) presented the main achievements of the Team in the 2013-2017 period and informed the Team about the proposed Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Team for the 2018-2021, prepared in consultation with the Team. There were no further proposals for amendments, a representative of the Montreal Process secretariat suggested communicating the new ToR to the Montreal Process, especially since the new text mentions availability of the Team for cooperation with the Montreal Process. The text of a new ToR is available in the Annex V to this report. The presentation delivered is available at the meeting's website.*

*During the meeting, the Team's members took part in a field trip to forests organized and hosted by the County Governor of Troms. The field trip was an excellent opportunity to acquaint with the region of Troms, its nature, history and culture as well. The field trip focused on forest management in the region and included presentation of natural and cultivated forests and the roles they played nowadays and in the past. Participants were also introduced with the farm forestry and small scale wood processing as well as challenges and achievements of private forest owners.*

- Item 6. Under the item "Exchange of information on future meetings and activities; other matters", Ms. Stefanie Linser (BOKU/EFI) informed the Team about the new set of indicators for SFM for Austria. The set was revised under coordination of the Central-East and South-East European Regional Office of the European Forest Institute (EFICEEC) and recently adopted by the Austrian Forest Forum; more information about the process and the indicator set can be found at [www.eficeec.efi.int](http://www.eficeec.efi.int).*

- Item 7. The Team of Specialists expressed its sincere gratitude to the Norwegian hosts, the Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research and the County Governor of Troms, for the kind invitation and support to the organization of the meeting, as well for the exceptional hospitality it received in Norway.*

*Special thanks were expressed to Mr. Stein M. Tomter, the Senior Scientific Adviser and Leader of the Team, and Ms. Gro Hysten, Research Scientist, for their contribution and engagement in the preparation and organization of the event, as well as to Ms. Trude Hagen Hansen, Mr. Brynjar Jørgensen and all involved in the organization of the field trip, for excellent event, guidance and warm welcome to the Troms region.*

*The meeting was closed at 12:00 on 24 May 2017.*

## Annex I

### **Fifth (25<sup>th</sup>) meeting of the “UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on monitoring sustainable forest management”**

*Tromsø, Norway 22-24 May 2017*

#### **Agenda**

#### **Monday, 22 May 2017**

- Item 1. Opening and welcome by the representative of the host country (Norway), Mr. Anssi PEKKARINEN (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) and Mr. Roman MICHALAK (UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section). Adoption of the Agenda.
- Item 2. Short presentation on Norwegian forests and forestry (Ms. Gro Hysten).
- Item 3. Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) – organisation of the process and content of the 2020 reporting cycle. (Mr. Anssi PEKKARINEN and Mr. Örjan JONSSON, FAO Rome).
  - a. Presentation of the overall preparatory process for FRA 2020;
  - b. Working group session 1: FRA 2020 specification, terms and definitions;
  - c. Working group session 2: FRA platform (reporting, review, analysis and dissemination platform).

#### **Tuesday, 23 May 2017**

- Item 4. Organisation the of process and the content of the regional reporting (Mr. Martin MORAVČÍK, Mr. Rastislav RAŠI and Mr. Matej SCHWARZ– FOREST EUROPE, Mr. Roman MICHALAK, UNECE/FAO):
  - a. Terms, definitions and classifications for Pan-European indicators for SFM:
    - i. Pilot studies on the new pan-European indicators,
    - ii. Reporting format and definitions of substantially altered indicators,
    - iii. Adjustment to global definitions and classifications.

#### **Field trip**

## Wednesday, 24 May 2017

- Item 4. Organisation the of process and the content of the regional reporting (Mr. Martin MORAVČÍK, Mr. Rastislav RAŠI and Mr. Matej SCHWARZ – FOREST EUROPE, Mr. Roman MICHALAK, UNECE/FAO):
- b. Organisation of the process, actors and milestones:
    - i. Tentative roadmap for the preparation next report on State of Europe's Forests;
    - ii. National data collection process for quantitative and qualitative indicators;
    - iii. Coordination and cooperation between the global and the pan-European data collection processes.
- Item 5. Strategic Review of the IPoW – the ToR and activities of the Team in the IPoW 2018-2021 (Secretariat).
- Item 6. Exchange of information on future meetings and activities; other matters.
- Item 7. Closure of the meeting.

---

**Venue:** Quality Hotel Saga, Richard With's pl. 2, NO-9251 Tromsø.  
<https://www.nordicchoicehotels.com/quality/quality-hotel-saga/>

**Currency:** 1 EUR = approx. 9.4 Norwegian Kroner (NOK)

**Logistics:** See more information at: <https://www.visittromso.no/en/Troms%C3%B8%20Airport>

**Meeting hours:**

Monday, 22 May 2017	09.00 – 13.00: Items 1- 3
	14.00 – 18.00: Item 3 (cont.)
Tuesday, 23 May 2017	08:00 – 12:00: Item 4
	13.00 – 22.00: Field trip
Wednesday, 24 May 2017	08.00 – 12.00: Item 4 (cont.), 5 - 6

*Each session with a 15' coffee break*

## Annex II

### List of participants

First name	Last name	Organization	E-mail
Annemarie	Bastrup-Birk	European Environment Agency (EEA)	annemarie.bastrup-birk@eea.europa.eu
Urs-Beat	Brändli	Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research (WSL)	urs-beat.braendli@wsl.ch
Antoine	Colin	Institut national de l'information géographique et forestière (IGN), France	antoine.colin@ign.fr
Andreas	Eriksson	Swedish Forest Agency	andreas.eriksson@skogsstyrelsen.se
Johannes	Hangler	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management (BMLFUW), Austria	johannes.hangler@bmlfuw.gv.at
Gro	Hylen	Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research	gro.hylen@nibio.no
Marek	Jabłoński	Forest Research Institute, Poland	M.Jablonski@ibles.waw.pl
Örjan	Jonsson	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Orjan.Jonsson@fao.org
Anssi	Kainulainen	Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners, Finland	anssi.kainulainen@mtk.fi
Kari T.	Korhonen	Natural Resources Center (LUKE), Finland	kari.t.korhonen@luke.fi
Jaroslav	Kubišta	Forest Management Institute (FMI), Czech Republic	kubista.jaroslav@uhul.cz
Andrius	Kuliešis	State Forest Service of Lithuania	Andrius.Kuliesis@amvmt.lt
Adrian	Lanz	Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research (WSL)	adrian.lanz@wsl.ch
Stefanie	Linser	European Forest Institute – Central-East European Regional Office (EFICEEC)	stefanie.linser@efi.int
Toshimasa	Masuyama	Forestry Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Japan	toshimasa_masuyam370@maff.go.jp
Roman	Michalak	UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section	roman.michalak@unece.org
Martin	Moravčík	FOREST EUROPE - Liaison Unit Bratislava	moravcik@nlcsk.org
Jan	Oldenburger	Probos Foundation, the Netherlands	jan.oldenburger@probos.nl
Anssi	Pekkarinen	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Anssi.Pekkarinen@fao.org
Ivana	Pešut	Ministry of Agriculture, Croatia	ivana.pesut@mps.hr
Rastislav	Raši	FOREST EUROPE - Liaison Unit Bratislava	rastislav.rasi@foresteurope.org
John	Redmond	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Ireland	johnj.redmond@agriculture.gov.ie
Friedrich	Schmitz	Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Germany	Friedrich.Schmitz@bmel.bund.de
Matej	Schwarz	FOREST EUROPE - Liaison Unit Bratislava	matej.schwarz@foresteurope.org
Toni	Strandell	Reaktor	toni.strandell@reaktor.com
Andrzej	Talarczyk	Bureau for Forest Management and Geodesy, Poland	Andrzej.Talarczyk@zarzad.buligl.pl
Stein Michael	Tomter	Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research	stein.tomter@nibio.no
María	Torres-Quevedo	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Food and Environment, Spain	mtquevedo@magrama.es
Mati	Valgepea	Estonian Environment Agency	mati.valgepea@envir.ee
James	Westfall	U.S. Forest Service	jameswestfall@fs.fed.us



## Annex III

### FRA 2020 - feedback from ToS – 22 May 2017

**Feedback on the reporting content. The presented material reflects feedback from members of the Team, cannot be considered as agreed position/recommendation.**

***Table 1a: Extent of forest and other wooded land***

1. table title to be revised
  2. “temporarily unstocked” instead of “unstocked”
  3. 1.a.5 Not quite clear if all the sub-categories actually belong to Other Land with Tree Cover as this category should meet the “forest” definition apart from the land use criteria
  4. Annual reporting is OK
  5. We should be careful with the term “compulsory” as the rest may be interpreted as non-compulsory
  6. How are the “young trees” defined within temporarily unstocked areas?
  7. What is included in the unstocked? Forest roads in addition to clear cuttings?
  8. What is the use of this variable?
  9. Young tree areas may not fit within un-stocked.
  10. What about permanently un-stocked (e.g. forest roads)? Also temporarily unstocked vs. permanently unstocked (forest roads) was mentioned.
  11. Land area: fixed for all years or can change between the years?
  12. Other land: sometimes the new forest areas do not necessarily belong legally to “forest” in some of the countries. Therefore the NFI is not covering them.
  13. Subcategories: suggestion to add other to allow summing up to 100%. Reporting may be challenging in some countries
  14. Some countries will have problem with annual reporting. Interpolation could be done by the FAO for countries that do not have the data.
  15. FAOSTAT data may be correct in most cases, but a clear deadline should be given to countries for updating outdated data. The problem of external data sources and changing it was mentioned also later in the discussion
  16. “young trees” is problematic as trees below 5m may actually be old in certain conditions. Better term needed here.
  17. 1a4 Need to define agroforestry properly. E.g. Cork Oak forests may belong to forest OR agricultural land, depending on the country.
  18. Palms is a good addition
- 

***Table 1b: Annual forest area loss, gain and net change***

1. All proposed changes fine
2. Change of the reference period will generate new figures. Forest area net change should correspond to figures in 1a (which it does).
3. Natural expansion may be challenging to report on
4. Several countries have good data for reforestation, why was it dropped?
5. On the other hand the idea (dropping deforestation) was supported as the natural regeneration is difficult to assign for a specific year.
6. Many developing countries do not separate afforestation and reforestation. Therefore we may need to discuss this further
7. Cross check with Table 1a should be explicitly mentioned to make clear what expansion and deforestation actually mean.

8. UNFCCC reporting has afforestation, reforestation and deforestation. In that context the reforestation refers to land use.
9. Sometimes table 1a and 1b may be inconsistent. In some countries areas that meet the definition of forest growing on agricultural land, but they may be reported as forest in the future (change in legislation/governance)
10. The complexity of the problem depends on the source of data. NFI vs forest management plans.
11. Afforestation can also be very complex to assess especially in the case where the “forest” has been recently established and may actually be converted back to agricultural land.

---

***Tables 2: Forest characteristics and specific categories***

1. Table 2a logical but still suffers from the difficulty in separating natural and planted forests. Semi-natural category could be a solution. **Unknown should also be a category.** Forest Europe reports on Semi Natural.
2. 2a primary forest may be more important issue outside of Europe. In many countries there are no virgin forests.
3. 2a – not clear what is the difference between plantations and other planted. The concept is politically sensitive – regeneration vs. management objective. Sometimes difficult to determine the origin.
4. No comments on 2b
5. Improve the consistency of primary forest data. Are forests introduced to non-forest areas due to CC considered as primary forest?

***Tables 3: Forest growing stock, biomass and carbon***

6. a1 OK
7. a2 definition of growing stock – stump level was promoted by the COST action and other processes.
8. Many times the countries have the figures for volume including branches
9. a3 Annual reporting OK (interpolation) adding annual increment. Data will change after new inventory data arrives
10. Why top ten and not top 5 species?
11. Better not to use the amount (m<sup>3</sup>) but the area covered for introduced species.
12. Biomass – OK to drop OWL but the biomass of deadwood needs to be collected in any case. Worth keeping it.
13. Skipped several obligations for OWL although several countries have recently included OWL as the reporting was needed earlier. This may discourage the ministries to finance the data collection.
14. mineral/organic – difficult to get the information
15. 3a growing stock – new figures added coniferous and broadleaved - how about mixed stands? Difficult to interpret
16. Volume / ha requires some models, might be ok
17. Growing stock definition change can be difficult for many countries and decrease confidence on the work
18. 3a Should be feasible to provide the figures for introduced tree species. No objection but not clear how important it is.
19. Definition of introduced species – interpretation at the national level.
20. Dropping of OWL supported. Deadwood not additional work. Good to keep.
21. Differentiations between mineral and organic soils is possible to do. Yearly series do not make much sense (little change)



22. Growing stock - inconsistency between 3a / 3b. Better to be consistent and always request totals to avoid rounding related inconsistencies (no. of decimals).
23. Mixed – unknown to be added (not sure what this comment was about, I think it was referring to FRA 2015 tables)
24. Previously ten most frequent species, keep reporting that way
25. Is re-ranking the species necessary or do they keep the same position in the table (or which year should be the reference year for the ranking of species).
26. 3c Dropping OWL biomass.
27. Dropping deadwood OK.
28. Automated biomass calculation with IPCC OK if the prefilled values can be replaced with country derived values.
29. Not to have OWL here may result in inconsistencies with UNFCCC reporting. How to avoid that?
30. Mineral / Organic – skeptical. Probably won't be able to produce the data.

***Table 5a: Primary designated management objective***

1. The table is politically sensitive and the interpretation of the table is therefore rather challenging. The management objectives of the owners are difficult to assess.
2. In general, problems with the social services and multiple-use.
3. How about categories for protective function (avalanches, etc).
4. Unknown needed.
5. What this table is used for and what it can be used for?
6. Not happy with the 100% summation requirements.
7. The management objectives of private forest owners are not clear.
8. How about using the forest available for production, etc.
9. Multiple use is not a primary function.
10. First table should use higher level objectives and the second have the specifics for example for the multiple use.
11. Proposal to collect qualitative info on multiple use.

***Feedback on the modality used to collect the feedback***

- Facilitator needed to ask the questions to speed up the teams
- Good work in developing the questions. Having them is a good idea although at times (although may limit the discussions)
- If groups are geographically mixed, they could solve the problems already during the group discussion.
- Heterogeneous groups result in increased knowledge and experience sharing
- Provide WGs with the definitions, facilitator, etc.
- Send the material beforehand

***Feedback on the FRA platform development***

- Generally the original country data input was received well
- Add functionality to extract the entered information (e.g. xls)
- User interface appreciated

## Annex IV

### Pan-European reporting - feedback from ToS – 23-24 May 2017

**Feedback on the presented framework of new indicators. The presented material reflects feedback from members of the Team, cannot be considered as agreed position/recommendation.**

#### *Indicator 2.5 FOREST LAND DEGRADATION (trends in)*

1. To cover desertification as it was initially requested by e.g. Turkey and Spain.
2. The proposed definition<sup>1</sup> covers only forest areas that are temporarily unstocked, stocked areas can be considered as degraded forest (not land), which is not included in the indicator.
3. Before defining “degraded land” a definition of “land” should be provided.
4. As degraded land should be considered areas without trees (unstocked).
5. In FRA, long-term loss of stocking corresponds to deforestation, FRA threshold for canopy is 10%.
6. The reason of degradation is often unknown.
7. The pre-condition should be location in forest land (site-conditions).
8. How to decide what it is “long term”.
9. To add “desertification” and to remove “poor forest management” to/from the definition.
10. If we report areas that are not currently classified as forest (if degradation “severely delays reforestation”), that would change the whole reporting.
11. The definition requires further adjustment. The topic will be opened on the FOREST EUROPE Communication Platform (accessible from the FOREST EUROPE homepage through Login). ToS requested to be informed on the initiation of discussion..
12. There are two different concepts – degraded land and degraded forest.
13. Thresholds for forest characteristics should be defined (e.g. stocking level/density).
14. Time and result of forest restoration also depends on invested money and effort.
15. Forest land restoration should be reported as well.
16. As degraded should be considered only the land below thresholds defined for forest.
17. To take into consideration that for SDG indicator on the land degradation is responsible UNCCD.
18. Thresholds for e.g. spatial extent, time span, land category should be set up.
19. Deforested forest land should be taken into account.

#### *Indicator 4.7 FOREST FRAGMENTATION*

1. There is opinion that our forests are fragmented, however, it is unclear whether all fragmentation is negative.
2. The indicator should be considered in relation to the requirements of target species (specifically endangered).
3. Figures on fragmentation should not be judged as good or bad (not interpreted).
4. As it is an indicator at international level, there are options to develop the pan-European approach, or to focus on national approaches, taking into account different sizes of European countries.
5. The applicability also for Russia should be considered.
6. Interpretation of results remains a challenge.
7. The natural barriers should be considered specifically, examples of assessment should support decision on the approach.
8. Clear-cuts should be considered specifically (or always considered as non-fragmenting).
9. Remote sensing based method is the most objective.

---

<sup>1</sup> Definition proposed for further discussion on FOREST EUROPE Communication Platform: degraded forest land – forest land severely damaged by the desertification, fires, grazing, air pollution, erosion, management, etc., with soil and vegetation damaged to a degree that severely delays the re-establishment of stocking.

10. The threshold should be defined for the area of patch/continuous forest as well as what should be considered as a barrier (or non-fragmenting element).
11. If any input from countries is expected, it should be harmonized.
12. The tool developed at EC – DG JRC allows for remote sensing based data processing, processing can be done either centrally at JRC or by countries.
13. Preliminary results would be presented at the next meeting of FOREST EUROPE Expert Group on Implementation of the Updated Pan-European Indicators for SFM.
14. Centralized data processing would support harmonized approach.
15. If countries have better data they could do their own processing or to deliver it to JRC in raster form. The focus should be on the change in time.
16. JRC approach would be applied on CORINE dataset validated by countries, however, this dataset does not cover whole pan-European region. As the alternative inputs, forest masks could be used, however, their quality is usually not approved by countries.
17. The meaning of indicator should be identified.
18. Forest geometry versus biodiversity – JRC experts say that it is quite difficult to interpret fragmentation from biodiversity viewpoint, not taking into account scale/species factor.
19. The option of NFI as a source of data would be considered in the future.
20. As the new indicator is based on former indicator Landscape Pattern, there is also option to report the same categories as in 2015.
21. As there is growth of forest area due to afforestation, the indicator would probably be interpreted positively.
22. Countries should be involved in data processing and interpretation.

#### ***Indicator 4.10 COMMON FOREST BIRD SPECIES***

1. The quality of data collected by NGOs and volunteers may vary, indicator meaning and interpretation – the trends in forests are better than other.
2. Connection to SFM.
3. To consider year 2000 as a starting point.
4. Availability of data – in EUROSTAT database are aggregated data and coverage of countries is incomplete.
5. Possible reporting by countries but availability of the data is limited.
6. The source of the data should be quoted.
7. Data from 1990 are considered the baseline, however their quality is disputable as the experts were just establishing their methods that time.
8. EUROSTAT data are based on country reports from different particular years; the countries data are not updated regularly.
9. Ideally, data should be collected at national level.

### **Feedback on the proposed reporting format of substantially altered indicators**

#### ***Indicator 1.4 Forest carbon***

1. Harvested wood product should not be split into subcategories.
2. To report only figures reported under UNFCCC.

#### ***Indicator 4.2 Regeneration***

1. Newly introduced subcategory “Unknown” to be harmonized with FRA reporting.

#### ***Indicator 4.3 Naturalness***

1. It should be clarified, whether subcategory “naturalized” covers invasive species.
2. Possible option of structured “semi-natural” of which ...
3. Newly introduced subcategory “Unknown” to be harmonized with FRA reporting or to drop it.

#### ***Indicator 6.4 Investments in forests and forestry***

1. To clarify whether EU funding is external or domestic.
2. To clarify where ODA should be reported.
3. Collection of data on expenditures should continue, it is collected in FRA as well.
4. Wording of indicator title differs from reported categories listed in the Background document.
5. It is difficult to get figures, especially split to public and private.
6. Apply NACE codes for sector definitions.
7. Private investments/expenditures to public forests to be included, e.g. for hunting.
8. Indicator is broad and reflects whole budget of the sector.
9. Linkage to the qualitative indicators (institutional framework, financial and economic instruments) should be set up.
10. Further adjustment of indicator is necessary; FOREST EUROPE Communication Platform would serve for this purpose.
11. The consistency with indicator 6.2 (Contribution of forest sector to GDP) and indicator 6.3 (Net revenue) is required.

#### ***Indicator 6.10 Recreation in forests***

1. Intensity of use of existing facilities is usually not measured.
2. Possibilities of assessment and reporting of visits in forests are limited.
3. Some facilities are not located at forest land (e.g. constructions).
4. Further adjustment of indicator is necessary, FOREST EUROPE Communication Platform would serve for this purpose.

### **ECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Monitoring Sustainable Forest Management**

#### ***Proposed Terms of Reference to the Integrated Programme of Work 2018-2021***

##### **A. Objectives**

1. To strengthen the work on: (i) forest reporting, (ii) assessing the state of forests and sustainability of forest management and (iii) monitoring the role of the forest sector in a green economy in the ECE region;
2. To advise the joint ECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section on the implementation of activities in Work Area 1 “Data, monitoring and assessment”, with regard to the collection, harmonization, review, analysis and dissemination of quantitative and qualitative information on forests and sustainable forest management (SFM) in the ECE region.

##### **B. Activities and functions**

1. Contribute to the global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) and the Collaborative Forest Resources Questionnaire 2020; support the data collection process, analysis of the status and trends, and the drafting and reviewing of the final report.
2. Contribute to the work on criteria and indicators (C&I) for sustainable forest management by Forest Europe and the Montréal Process.
3. Assist the preparatory process of the State of Europe’s Forests 2020: contribution to the reporting on quantitative indicators, analysis of information, coordination of inputs, authors’ contributions and dissemination of results.
4. Contribute to further work on the assessment of the sustainability of forest management.
5. Contribute to the work on the development of global and regional forest indicators to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and the United Nations Strategic Plan on Forests.
6. Contribute to the development of the concept and modalities for a statistical data management system on forest resources, functions and services and SFM.
7. Provide input to other work areas on issues relevant to data, monitoring and assessment including related capacity building, in particular to the UNDA project on “Accountability Systems for Sustainable Forest Management in the Caucasus and Central Asia”.
8. Support international work and cooperation on monitoring of forest resources and SFM, including the European Union (i.e. Eurostat, EEA, JRC) and other organizations (i.e. EFI, IUFRO, ICP) in this area.

##### **C. Expected major outputs and contributions**

1. Review of, and input to documents, reports, and meetings related to the global reporting framework – in cooperation with the FAO Forest Resources Assessment Team.
2. Review of, and input to documents, reports, and meetings, especially those related to the activities “Further development and updating of policies and tools for sustainable forest management” and “Forest monitoring and reporting” under Forest Europe. Provide support in the organization of the workshop for authors and national correspondents in the ECE region; review of and, whenever possible, involvement in writing, support the drafting of report on the State of Europe’s Forests. Involvement in dissemination of results.

3. Review of, and input to documents, reports, and meetings on the development of global and regional forest indicators to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and the UN Strategic Plan on Forests.
4. Advice on issues relevant to the C&I processes in the ECE region.
5. Advice on designing an improved statistical data management system on forest resources, their functions and services, and forest management.
6. Advice on the other data-related work within Work Areas 1, 2, 3 and 4, in particular related to the measurement of the forest sector contribution to a green economy and forest sector outlook studies.

## **D. Background**

**Established/  
Approved by:** Joint Session of ECE COFFI and FAO EFC, Warsaw, Poland, 2017.

**Duration:** From January 2018 to December 2019. Renewable to 2021.

**Methods of work:** Regular ToS meetings (including steering group and thematic sub-groups meetings).

Participation in workshops with FRA national correspondents.

Reviews and consultations, in person, via videoconference and electronic means.

Review and, if feasible, preparation of background materials, discussion papers, enquiries.

Other forms of work can be determined by the ToS, if needed.

**Reporting:** *Annually, to the Joint ECE/FAO Working Party on Forest Statistics, Economics and Management*

**Team leader:** To be elected at the first Team meeting