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**Key findings**

Exchange of experiences and receive input/guidance for implementation at national level are considered main sources of personal motivation.

Support from the countries to the work of experts is at good level, yet lack of funding was mentioned as problem and finding funding for the work of ToS from international sources was proposed. Also possibilities to combine efforts with other projects or programmes was proposed

Personal communication, meetings and seminars are named as main methods for sharing information on the work of ToS in countries.

ToS mandate is unanimously regarded as clear. Developing the C&I and supporting reporting to SoEF and Global FRA are regarded as strong points of the ToS

None of the respondents regard language as a problem.

Support from the UNECE secreteriat is regarded high.

No deficiencies were identified in the structure or representativeness of the team, yet response rate to this question was low. Coverage of expertise is mainly found sufficient.

Impact of the ToS work was not properly handled in the replies, this issue would need another study.

Only 8 members replied even though the questionnaire and a reminder was sent to 90 ToS members. Most of the 8 respondents did not reply to some of the questions. Low response rate indicates that the questionnaire was regarded as laborious to fill, this was indicated also by some of those who replied. All the respondents were representatives of countries.

**Information on the respondents**

1-3. The questionnaire was sent to 90 members from 35 countries and 16 international organisations . In total, 8 members, each from different country replied with at least partially filled questionnaire form (FI, CZ, BG, LT, IT, SK, CH, GE). Additionally, LU replied that they do not have the resource to participate in ToS activities. None of the NGO representatives responded.

4. All respondents stated that they have at least to some extent direct influence on the implementation of the outcome of the ToS in their country. As concrete examples, modifying of data collection (e.g. NFI) according to information needs and dissemination of outcomes were given.

**Personal motivation/inputs**

5. Exchange of experience, exchange with other members of the same ToS and receive input/guidance for implementation at national level were regarded as highest in personal motivation. The respondents were very harmonised in this opinion. Contribution to the UNECE/FAO programme of work was regarded high (score 4) in several replies and input to policy dialogue in some replies. Capacity building (training of trainers) was regarded as least important motivation in most replies.

6. Seven of the respondents replied on the question on his/her contribution to ToS. One respondent was currently a ToS leader. All 7 respondents are actively participating. 6 respondents are contributing with their own technical inputs/expertise and helping in dissemination of results (at least at national scale). Only 2 respondents are following the activities without active participation, obviously, most members that belong in this category did not reply to the questionnaire at all.

**Organisation of team/leadership**

7. Regarding national level organisation, several respondents mentioned communication with specialists and authorities from their own institutes and some mentioned also other national societies.

8-9. 6 of the 8 respondents get sufficient support from their own country or organisation, some respondents mentioned insufficient funding, few also lack of interest. As a solution, 2 respondents mentioned international funding to support participation and one mentioned providing stronger support and advocacy from UNECE.

10. Sharing of information from the ToS within respondents own countries is mainly via personal communication, meetings and seminars. Some respondents mentioned articles in national media.

11. The question of the resource implications was mainly not replied or misunderstood, results not worth analysing.

12. None of the respondents regard language as a problem.

13. Out of the 8 respondents, 7 replied the question on evaluating the ToS leadership/guidance. 5 of them were very positive, giving highest (mainly 5, sometimes 4) scores in almost every item. The remaining two respondents gave score 3 in couple of items but there was no single item where the two slighty critical respondents would have both given score 3.

14-15. Out of the 8 respondents, 7 regard the ToS mandate clear, one did not reply this question. Also, the procedures reporting back to UNECE are regarded as clear.

**Thematic content of the ToS**

16. Developing the C&I and supporting reporting to SoEF and Global FRA are regarded as strong points of the ToS. The respondents were very unanimous on this.

17. The coverage of expertise within the ToS is regarded as good. One respondent regards that the ToS even too many members. One respondent proposes that the ToS would pay greater attention to contributing institutional cooperation on forest monitoring, improving countries capacities and supporting developing national systems. More expertise related to nature conservation was proposed for the team.

18. All respondents regard exchange and discussion within ToS useful.

19. Only 5 replied to the question on main deliverables and outputs. Preparation and review of the SoEF report was regarded as high by almost all of these.

20. Only 3 respondents replied the question on receiving feedback/comments. Two of them replied not receiving feedback, one replied that email is used for communication.

**Structure of the Team**

21. 4 respondents regard the composition of the team as representative region-wise, 4 did not reply this question.

22. 4 respondents regard the level of representation fair and satisfactory, 3 did not reply this, 1 proposed identifying the real members of the team.

23-25. None of the respondents find bias in respect to regions or affiliation. All respondents (that replied this specific question) regard the team as well balanced in respect to affiliation.

26. Average score for level of expertise was 4.5

**Support from the secretariat**

27. Support was ranked very high, score 5 or 4 in almost every item and every reply. Two respondents gave score 3 to technical inputs/advice, the rest either 5 or 4 also for this item.

28-29. Two respondents mentioned the shortage of financial sources/support, one mentioned paying more attention to capacity building at regional level, the rest did not identify any shortfalls. Combining the work of ToS with other related projects or programmes was proposed as a solution to lack of resources.

**Impact of ToS/Commnication**

30. 3 respondents consider that the outputs of the ToS are used well, 5 did not reply.

31. 3 respondents consider the communication of the work of the ToS good or sufficient, one respondent doubts that a smaller team would communicate more efficiently, 4 did not reply.

32. 3 respondent regard the impact of the work/results of ToS successfully, at least inside forest sector. One respondent give score 3 and 4 respondents did not reply to this question. Only one respondent provide example: the materials/publications are well known and widely used in elaborating national policy documents, decision making and comparing forestry between countries. Outside the forest sector they serve in asserting the justified interests of forestry in cross-sectoral relations.

33. Only 3 respondents provided proposals for this questions: 1) reports must be short, concise and accurate 2) active dissemination of the results at national level before meetings 3) documents must be disseminated early.