

ECE-FAO Forestry and Timber Programme Strategic Review 2013

Questionnaire for Teams of Specialists

At the joint meeting in Antalya in October 2011, the ECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission approved the methodology and timeline for the Strategic Review of the joint ECE/FAO integrated programme on Forestry and Timber. This exercise is usually undertaken every 4-5 years and will determine priorities up to 2017.

As part of this strategic review, ECE/FAO Teams of Specialists were requested to provide feedback into this process. To this end, and to facilitate internal consultation, the TC and EFC bureaux prepared the set of questions below. Based on the replies to the questionnaire, ToS leaders should prepare a note to be presented and discussed at the next meeting of the Working Party on Forest Statistics, Economics and Management, to be held in Geneva in March 2012.

As documents need to be posted in advance of the meeting on the ECE website, the Secretariat would be grateful to receive the final note from the Team Leader no later than **15 February 2012**. It will be posted on the ECE website as an information note in support of the discussions at the WP meeting.

ToS leaders are kindly requested to seek participation in this exercise from all the members. Please contact the ECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section (paola.deda@unece.org) if there are any questions regarding the exercise.

Replies to this questionnaire should be inserted directly in this document and submitted directly to the ToS leader. However, if respondents wish to remain anonymous, replies can be sent directly to the Forestry and Timber Section (address above) and the content of the questionnaire will be forwarded to the leader without revealing the identity of the respondent.

**Please note that my comments are limited to the experience within the ToS Forest Policy in EECA.
No comments are made to any other ToS.**

Information on the respondent:

1. Name and position/title (please refer to the note above should you wish to remain anonymous).
Michael Sutter; Delegate of Austria; Austrian Federal Forests / Director PC Consulting
2. Of which ToS are you a member?
ToS Forest Policy in EECA
3. How long have you been a member of this ToS?
3 Years
4. In your position, do you have a direct influence on the implementation of the outcome of the ToS work in your country? Please elaborate.
Official delegate from Austria; indirect influence on decisions; close cooperation with the Ministry

Personal Motivation/inputs

5. What is your main motivation in participating in the work of the ToS?

Please provide list and rank each item from 1 to 5 (1 being lowest motivation, 5 highest motivation).

- 4 Expert exchange of experiences and lessons learnt
- 4 Input to policy dialogue
- 4 Tangible outputs such as publications/reports/strategies
- 5 Exchange with other members of the same ToS
- 2 Exchange with members of other ToS
- 3 Contribution to the regional input at global level
- 2 Receive input/guidance for implementation at national level
- 1 Capacity building (training of trainers)
- 3 Contribution to the UNECE/FAO programme of work
- Others (please specify):

6. What is your present specific contribution to the ToS?

Please answer “yes” or “no” to the following.

- No Leading the ToS
- Yes Actively participating in the ToS meetings
- No Following the activities of ToS without active participation
- Yes Contributing with own technical inputs/expertise
- No Co-organising meetings as host
- Yes Helping in dissemination of results (outputs?) of ToS
- Other contributions (please specify).

Organisation of team/leadership

7. How are you organised at the national level in preparing the ToS meetings and sharing results at national level?

Close cooperation with relevant experts in the Ministry

Joint preparation of input

8. Do you think you are receiving sufficient support from your own country to participate in these teams? What kind of limitations has your team experienced as regards participation of team members in your events (insufficient funding, lack of members' interest etc.), if any?

No funds were made available; funds had to be provided by our own Organization

9. How would you suggest that these shortcomings be overcome?

Do not expect funding from our Ministry.

Support by UNECE for accommodation / flights of participants

10. How do you share information from the ToS work within your own country?

Email and meetings; primarily with Ministry and within our Organization

11. What have been the resource implications to implement ToS work by your team? How much time and effort did you contribute to the ToS work? What about other resources?

In the first two years: 10 working days a year + international travel, accommodation, communication costs

This year: 2 working days

12. Would you consider language as a “critical problem” in your meetings, since ToS meetings do not normally benefit from full translation? If yes, what would you propose to mitigate this communication problem?

The language barriers is splitting into two groups (which to a certain extent have known each other before).

To overcome the issue: provide full translation during meetings

13. How do you assess the leader/guidance of your ToS?

Roadmap / workplan agreed in Budapest are good; however it was not fully implemented.

No communication by the Leader within the last 2 years.

On question 13, please provide list, ranking each item 1 (lowest quality) to 5 (highest quality) :

- 2 Overall guidance
- 2 Sharing of information and stepwise results
- 4 Scheduling and planning events
- 2 Reporting/dissemination of results of ToS
- 4 Organisation of events
- 2 Output/result of the ToS
- ? Reporting to UNECE/FAO
- Others (please specify) .

14. Do you think that the ToS mandate, as expressed in the ToR, is clear for the team leader/co-leaders concerning planning, operational, communication matters, including reporting to UNECE/FAO?

?

15. Are procedures for reporting back to UNECE/FAO clear enough? If not, how could they be improved?

Establish reporting requirements

Discuss reporting obligations by each participant; ask for written confirmation

Manage implementation

Thematic content of your ToS

16. In your opinion, which topics/themes of the ToS were appropriate and successful (=strong points of ToS) and should be continued for 2014-2017?

As to my current information I believe that the ToS is existing only on paper.

The start was promising but commitment of participants was weak. No communication on the very ToS, especially about to-dos and next steps.

17. Is all needed expertise in the ToS present, or is other expertise needed (may be from other sectors or disciplines) to better carry out the task of the ToS?

This depends on the envisioned output; which today is unclear for me

18. Do you consider exchanges and discussions within the ToS useful?

The first meeting in Budapest was worth participating and a good means of a common dialogue.

The second meeting in Istanbul was nice but produced a disappointing low level of tangible results.

Real communication and exchange on in 4 eyes telephone meetings.

19. What have been the deliverables and main outputs of the ToS? What impact have they made?
Rank the technical quality of your major outputs at a scale of 1 (lowest quality) to 5 (highest quality).

- 5 Tangible results of Budapest workshop
- 4 Glossary
- ? other tangible results

20. Do you receive feedbacks/comments concerning the disseminated outputs, whether printed or online, of your team? If so, how do you discuss and take them into consideration for the subsequent team outputs?

Feedback only during the two meetings or in actively on the telephone

Structure of the Team

21. In your opinion, how representative is the composition of the team TC/EFC region-wise (e.g., in terms of how many of the countries in the region are represented; or what portion (forestland-wise or area-wise) of the region is represented by members of the team)?

The team composition would have a great potential; however this potential was not fully used.

22. Do you consider the current level of representation fair and satisfactory? If not, what sort of action do you think should be taken?

There are no activities which I would be aware of

23. Would you say there is regional bias within the team? (e.g. too much emphasis on an individual country or a subregion, which overshadows subregions that need the attention of the Team?)

No

24. Do you think that the composition of the team is critical with respect to the affiliation (government, universities or NGO's) of the member specialists?

In theory: yes. However lessons learned in the past three years indicate that active commitment to the ToS (preparation, participation in discussion, readiness to share experience, ...) is key.

25. How "balanced" is your team in respect of the members' affiliations (government experts, university experts and NGOs' experts)?

The team is comprised by country representatives, which primarily are administration or close to the administration. External experts and NGOs have once been invited in Istanbul for direct involvement.

26. Do you consider the level of "expertise" in your team as a whole sufficient for your work? (please rank in a scale of scale of 1 – not sufficient - to 5 – optimum level)

4

Support from the Secretariat

27. How do you assess of the support by the UNECE/FAO secretariat to your ToS?

Provide list, ranking each item 1 (lowest quality) to 5 (highest quality):

- 4 Overall guidance
- 4 Providing timely information and documents
- 4 Technical inputs/advice
- 5 Preparation of minutes
- 5 Organisation of events
- 2 Guidance on reporting
- 3 Distribution of ToS results
- Other (pls specify).

28. Do you see shortfalls, for example in terms of resources or mandate, and how do you think these can be overcome?

Additional resources would facilitate the progress:

- 1 Full translation during workshops
2. Contribution / full payment of workshop participation

I suggest linking support to preparation of participants prior to the workshops.

29. In the case of lack of resources, do you have any suggestions on how to supplement them through alternative means?

Same as other big international workshops: Event sponsoring, side-event sponsoring, partner sponsoring, Combining the workshop with other targets of countries (MOUs, ...)

Impact of ToS/Communication

30. How well are the outputs of the ToS being used in your opinion?

The usage was limited

31. How do you assess the communication of the work of the ToS internally with other ToS, within the forest sector and outside the forest sector? How can it be improved?

No information about dissemination of results with other ToS

32. How do you assess the impact of the work/results of the ToS inside/outside the forest sector, and how can it be improved? Please provide examples if available.

The potential was not structured in a way which identified specific recipients of the work results, such as an input to the EU forest strategy process.

Such results would require the specific mandate, specific targets, commitment and clear management of the process.

33. At the last session of UNECE/FAO TC/EFC in Antalya in October 2011, it was decided that the reports of the ToS will be shared and discussed in the annual meetings of the Working Party on Forest Statistics, Economics and Management (which is scheduled for March 2012). The objective is to identify possible synergies, and facilitate the exchange of experiences between ToS and delegations from member States. What has to be done to make this exercise useful and successful, by UNECE/ FAO Secretariat and by the ToS?

I did not participate in Antalya.

Conclusions

34. Please add any other comments or information you wish to provide.
