

**REVIEW of the MCPFE/UNECE/FAO Report
State of Europe's Forests 2007
The MCPFE report on sustainable forest management in Europe
by the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists
on Monitoring Forest Resources for SFM in the UNECE Region**

Introduction

The Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) in Vienna in 2003 reaffirmed the role of the criteria and indicators for SFM as a tool for monitoring, assessing and reporting progress on sustainable forest management. In consequence of this and previous Ministerial commitments, the relevant report for the pan-European level for the 5th MCPFE Conference in Warsaw was elaborated.

The report's arrangement follows the structure of improved Pan-European Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forests Management, which include 35 quantitative and 12 qualitative indicators. The report is based on forest resources assessment data collected from MCPFE and FAO national correspondents and international data providers (IDPs), such as ICP Forests, Joint Research Center (JRC), Eurostat and others. Information on indicators 4.7 (Landscape pattern) and 6.4 (Expenditures for services) was presented in a form of case studies.

The MCPFE report on "State of Europe's Forests 2007" (SoEF 2007) continues the series of European forest resources assessments that had been prepared under auspices of UNECE and/or MCPFE, which is expected to be maintained. In the frame of preparations for the next assessment cycle it is of utmost importance to collect experiences and views from both report's users and producers.

The objective of this review is to provide preliminary input to the discussion under agenda item 4 "ToS review of the MCPFE Report "State of Forests and Sustainable Forest Management in Europe 2007"" at the upcoming UNECE Team of Specialists meeting 26-27 May 2008 in Vienna, Austria.

Moreover, the review results will furthermore provide invaluable input to the preparation of the process of reporting for the next Ministerial Conference, it could also be a contribution to the improvement of the European component to the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment.

The questionnaire is divided into **two parts**:

Part I: Report elaboration

Part II: MCPFE SoEF 2007 Report, dissemination

Please send the completed questionnaire to the UNECE/FAO secretariat (Christopher.prins@unece.org) and the Team Leader (ewald.rametsteiner@boku.ac.at) if possible, **before 23 May 2008**, in order to allow its consideration at the ToS meeting.

Please, do not hesitate to contact Ewald Rametsteiner (email see above) for further information.

- QUESTIONNAIRE -

Part I - Report elaboration process

(review of overall planning and time plan, questionnaire design, data collection, data validation, report writing and draft report review)

1. Do you consider general approach for the SoEF2007 preparations as appropriate? Please mark

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

2. Do you find the general organization of work (Advisory Group for the MCPFE SoEF 2007, degree and form of ToS involvement in preparation, National Correspondent networks, involvement of the International Data Providers) as sufficient and effective? Please mark

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

3. Do you consider the time schedule for the SoEF2007 preparations as appropriate and realistic?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

4. Do you evaluate process of national data collection/validation on *quantitative indicators collected through national correspondents*, including structure of the questionnaire, secretariat (LUW and UNECE/FAO) assistance and support, as well organised and well carried out?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

5. Do you evaluate process of data validation on quantitative indicators collected through International Data Providers, as well organised and well carried out?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

6. Do you evaluate process of national data collection/validation on qualitative indicators (structure of the questionnaire, data collection through MCPFE Focal Points) as well organised and well carried out?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

7. Did the provided opportunities for your participation in report elaboration (incl. data checking, draft report review) respond your expectations and needs?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

8. What can / should be improved or considered in any future SoEF report preparation process, according to your opinion?

Part II - Report contents and dissemination

1. Did the MCPFE SoEF2007 report meet your perceived general needs and satisfy your expectations?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

2. Is the overall structure of the MCPFE SoEF2007 report (six MCPFE criteria, quantitative and qualitative indicators, regional grouping) appropriate?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

3. How do you evaluate particular parts of the SoEF2007 report?

Please rate the following chapters from 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor) Please mark: 5 4 3 2 1 N/A

	<i>Arrangement/ Structure</i>	<i>Contents</i>	<i>Completeness/ data accuracy</i>
<i>Executive Summary</i>			
<i>Introductory Part</i>			
<i>MCPFE Quantitative Indicators</i>			
<i>MCPFE Qualitative Indicators</i>			
<i>Overview and Conclusions</i>			
<i>Annexes – data tables</i>			
<i>Annexes - other</i>			

Please explain any issue related to the report's content that needs improvement.

4. Is the graphic design (layout, graphs, maps and tables) of the MCPFE SoEF2007 report appropriate?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of "partly" or "no", please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

5. In your opinion, was report and data dissemination (report, leaflet, pdf) and promotion (e.g. special session at the 5th MCPFE, etc.) well designed and appropriate?

Yes [] Partly [] No []

In the case of “partly” or “no”, please explain why and provide suggestions for improvement, if possible

6. What can / should be improved or considered in any future SoEF report (structure, contents, format, etc.) or dissemination, according to your opinion?