

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General
27 July 2017

Original: English

**Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations****Economic Commission for Europe****Committee on Forests and the Forest Industry****Seventy-fifth session**

Warsaw, Poland 9-13 October 2017

Item 2(f) of the provisional agenda

Joint Committee/Commission matters:**Forest Resources Assessment 2020, enhancement and
streamlined reporting****Food and Agriculture Organization****European Forestry Commission****Thirty-ninth session**

Warsaw, Poland 9-13 October 2017

**Forest Resources Assessment 2020 (FRA2020),
enhanced and streamlined international reporting****Note by the Secretariat***Summary*

Delegates will be updated on the preparation of the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) 2020. Preparations for FRA2020 are carried out in a highly cooperative manner, with the participation of major global and regional forest related organizations and processes.

Delegates will also be informed about the proposal for strengthening collaboration on the Common Forest Resources Questionnaire through joint ECE, FAO and Forest Europe 2020 data collection on the pan-European indicators, which is planned to be carried out simultaneously with the global reporting.

The Commission and the Committee will be invited to discuss and to make recommendations on the FRA process in the region.

GE.17-11782(E)



* 1 7 1 1 7 8 2 *

Please recycle



I. Background

1. FAO has been monitoring the world's forests at five to ten year intervals since 1946. Recent Global Forest Resources Assessments (FRA) have been produced every five years to provide a consistent approach to describing the world's forests and how they are changing.
2. FRA is based on two sources of data: country reports, which are prepared by the officially nominated national correspondents, and satellite-based monitoring supported by field observations. The country reports are the cornerstone of the FRA process as they contain the official national statistics, which cover the seven thematic elements of the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). As of 6 June 2017, 161 countries and territories nominated their FRA2020 national correspondents.
3. The role of satellite-based remote sensing is different, as it is used mainly to assess tree cover, health and changes to provide global and regional level reference against which the summary of national statistics can be compared.
4. The scope of FRA has been evolving over time from timber-focused inventories to more holistic assessments that seek to respond to increasing information needs. At the same time the number of various information requests for countries has increased significantly, resulting in a heavier reporting burden.
5. In addition, insufficient coordination between the organizations and processes requesting the information, as well as lack of coordination between national authorities responsible for the reporting, can result in submission of different figures for the same or similar variables and indicators.

II. Committee on Forestry recommendations

6. At its twenty-third session, the Committee on Forestry (COFO) requested FAO to “continue working with the Secretariats of the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and other members of the CPF, as well as other relevant international processes to improve and streamline global reporting on forests, with the aim of identifying synergies and reducing the reporting burden on countries.”
7. Furthermore, COFO requested FAO to “review the Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) strategy, including its financing strategy, in consultation with FAO Members, members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) and other relevant international agencies and organizations, and align it as necessary towards the needs of monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as well as to the reporting needs of other global forests processes, aiming at the production and dissemination of robust forest physical and socioeconomic information, including by using remote sensing” and “pilot new methodologies for assessing regional and global trends in forest cover”.
8. As a response to these requests, FAO proposes to implement FRA2020 in a manner, which will reduce the overall reporting burden by developing a more efficient and focused reporting process and facilitates generation of transparent and up-to-date information on key forest variables and indicators.

III. Collaborative Forest Resources Questionnaire

9. In 2011, six international organizations¹ and processes joined forces to develop a Collaborative Forest Resources Questionnaire (CFRQ) with the intention to increase the efficiency of forest related data collection, analysis and reporting. The CFRQ was first used during FRA2015 and covered 104 countries representing some 88 per cent of the world's forest. Data gathered through the CFRQ were used many times and by several users, which reduced the reporting burden on countries and increased data consistency. The approach also promoted the use of common definitions and provided a basis for enhanced sharing of forest statistics.

10. The CFRQ experience was positive. Some 80 per cent of the national correspondents who responded to the FRA2015 evaluation questionnaire agreed that the CFRQ should be continued.

11. Based on this positive feedback FAO proposes the continuation of this collaboration for FRA2020 and is willing to explore possibilities for strengthening and expanding it further. In this context, ECE, FAO and Forest Europe have developed a proposal for joint pan-European reporting which would cover the CFRQ variables as well as additional data collected according to the Forest Europe criteria and indicators for SFM.

12. The proposed joint data collection would result in a significant decrease in national reporting burden. Furthermore, the initiative has great potential to improve data consistency and completeness in the pan-European region and it would result in a more efficient use of resources of the three cooperating partners. More information on the proposal can be found in Annex 1.

IV. Global Core Set of forest-related indicators

13. Another effort towards decreasing reporting burden and improving consistency of the reporting is being taken by a number of international organizations and processes through developing a global core set of forest-related indicators. Following several informal meetings, an international expert workshop in Ottawa, and an organization-led initiative (OLI) in Rome, the CPF launched a Joint Initiative to expedite work on the global core set.

14. In line with the OLI recommendations, the CPF established a Task Force to revise the core set of indicators proposed by the OLI and to steer further work on the indicators. The Task Force met in Rome in March 2017 and fine-tuned the OLI proposal.

15. The Task Force's proposal was then used as basis for an online consultation on the global core set. The purpose of the consultation was to collect views of a wide range of experts and stakeholders and it was conducted through the Food Security Network of FAO on 8 to 21 May 2017². There were 34 individuals or groups who contributed to the consultation, representing all regions and many different fields of expertise. During the three weeks, the webpage of the consultation received around 1,300 page views.

16. As many of the global core set indicators are already being reported on by FRA, the OLI meeting suggested also that the "... upcoming expert consultation on FRA in mid-2017

¹ FAO, the Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC/OFAC), FAO Forestry (FRA), Forest Europe, the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the Montréal Process and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE).

² The online consultation material is available at:
http://www.fao.org/fsnforum/activities/discussions/forestry_indicators.

could be used to expand the number of partners involved and further develop the CFRQ to cover a global core set of forest-related indicators to the extent possible”.

17. The FRA2020 Expert Consultation in 12 to 16 June 2017 reviewed the global core set and provided feedback to develop a revised version of the proposal (Annex 2).

18. UNFF, at its last session in May 2017 “noted the ongoing work led by the CPF to develop a global set of forest indicators for use in assessing progress on, inter alia, the Global Forest Goals and forest-related SDGs, and invited the CPF to present its proposal at UNFF13”.

19. Accordingly, the final draft will be submitted to UNFF13 and other governing bodies of CPF members during autumn 2017, as appropriate.

V. Sustainable Development Goals – Agenda 2030

20. The Inter-agency Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) agreed in March 2017 on the framework of targets and indicators to measure progress towards the SDGs. Two of the targets in SDG 15 (15.1 and 15.2) refer explicitly to forests and SFM, and a third target, 15.4, is to monitor the conservation of mountain ecosystems. FAO is the custodian agency for three indicators under these targets and thus responsible for the following main tasks: 1) development of relevant methodologies; 2) measurement of progress; 3) collection, compilation and validation of data; 4) submission of data and storylines to the United Nations Statistical Division; and 5) provision of support to enable countries to develop their reporting capacity.

21. FAO is responsible for these tasks for two forest related indicators, 15.1.1 “Forest area as a proportion of total land area” and 15.2.1 “Progress towards sustainable forest management”. The SDG reporting on these indicators has started and will continue on an annual basis. The data for these indicators will be collected and reviewed through the new FRA online reporting platform.

VI. Paris Agreement, Nationally Determined Contributions and the enhanced transparency framework

22. The Paris Agreement focuses on efforts to keep the increase in global average temperature to “well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels”. It also aims to strengthen countries’ ability to deal with climate change impacts. In addition, the Agreement presents a new transparency framework, which will evolve from the existing transparency system and will apply to all Parties.

23. The new transparency network foresees reporting on emissions at least every two years according to the provided guidance. These reports are subject to an expert review and should use commonly agreed accounting framework, which allows tracking of the progress towards Nationally Determined Contributions.

24. Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry was explicitly mentioned in 73 per cent of the submitted Intended Nationally Determined Contributions as a potential mitigation action³. In addition, roughly 70 countries mentioned forestry as one of the priority sectors for adaptation actions. Thus, reporting on forest-related carbon stores, sinks and sources is vital for the transparent and successful implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions.

³ <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2016/cop22/eng/02.pdf>.

25. The FRA reporting provides an indirect linkage to the reporting under the UNFCCC as it supports the process by enhancing the countries' capacity to produce greenhouse gas (GHG) data for the Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) sector. Furthermore, FRA provides an independent reference for the forest related emissions and removals reported to the UNFCCC, and FRA data and its terms and definitions support further development of the IPCC guidelines.

26. The FRA2020 reporting will contribute also to increase transparency through the development of a new online data submission, review, analysis and reporting platform, which will allow self-explanatory documenting of the reported values.

VII. Remote Sensing

27. FAO, with the financial support from a number of donors, has developed a set of tools for remote sensing-based data collection, analysis and mapping. Some of these tools are based on visual assessment of sample sites, while others can produce spatially explicit maps. These tools facilitate access to the latest freely available remote sensing data and allow analysis and processing in a fast and user-friendly manner.

28. These tools have already been used to support a number of countries to produce data and information on their forests, including on forest area and its changes. FAO, together with its partners and with financial aid from Germany and the EU, has also produced a global data set of roughly five hundred thousand visually assessed sample plots. This Global Forest Survey data set can be made available for countries for their review, revision and potential release to the public.

29. FRA2020 plans to use these tools and data for capacity development in a number of countries to support their efforts to produce better data on the forest area and its changes.

VIII. The way forward

30. The above-mentioned developments pose several new demands for the FRA process. First, a serious effort for reducing the reporting burden must be made by carefully considering the collected variables and indicators as well as their relevance and by further facilitating the FRA reporting process. Second, further expansion of the CFRQ and synergies with other reporting processes will minimise overlaps in data collection and improve consistency. Third, since reporting on the SDG indicators is to be done on an annual basis, FRA will need to support annual submissions, reviews and reporting on these data. Finally, to support countries in consistent reporting on key indicators, FRA, together with the other forest monitoring related projects and programmes of FAO, will need to strengthen the provision of the necessary capacity development to support countries in conducting field inventories and using remote sensing to estimate forest area changes.

31. Given the importance of up-to-date and transparent forest information for national policy making and international reporting, it is essential to promote transparent and open access to data. Efficient and open reporting platforms, combined questionnaires and related capacity development will help achieve consistent, timely, credible and transparent FRA reporting, which will serve also other international reporting processes. This can also help identify new opportunities to support countries in the actual data production process as the open and transparent systems are attractive to resource partners.

32. To meet some of these requirements FAO has prepared related capacity development plans and initiated design and development of a new online FRA Platform. The FRA Platform will facilitate filling in the FRA questionnaire and reviewing the reported data, as well as performing related analyses. In addition, it will provide the

necessary interpolation and extrapolation modules for production of the needed estimates for given reporting years, and greatly facilitate reporting on the biomass and carbon stocks and their changes according to the IPCC guidelines.

IX. Points for consideration

33. The Commission and the Committee may wish to request FAO and ECE to continue to work with Forest Europe at the ECE/FAO/Forest Europe data collection on forests and forest management, and coordinate it with the global reporting to the extent possible.

34. The Commission and the Committee may wish to encourage countries to:

(a) Participate actively in the FRA2020 reporting process, including the review and validation of remote sensing products; and

(b) Collaborate with ECE, FAO and partner institutions to achieve synergies in data collection, analysis and management, and to reduce duplication of efforts.

(c) Support the implementation of the ECE/FAO/Forest Europe proposal on joint pan-European reporting.

35. The Commission may wish to request FAO to:

(a) Continue supporting the development of the global core set concept and contribute to the collection of data for those indicators that are relevant for the FRA;

(b) Continue the development and implementation of the new FRA online platform to allow annual submissions, reviews and reporting on SDG indicators 15.1.1 and 15.2.1;

(c) Further strengthen the CFRQ and consider options for expanding it towards reporting with regional Criteria and Indicator processes;

(d) Make the country-specific remote sensing datasets available for national validation and to provide the necessary tools and support for data analysis and management; and

(e) Initiate the FRA capacity development activities on remote sensing methodologies and national spatial data infrastructure.

Annex I

Integrated ECE/FAO/Forest Europe Data collection on forests and forest management

I. Introduction

1. Since the endorsement of the Forest Europe Criteria and Indicators on SFM, data collection for the pan-European and global reporting on forests and forest management have been carried out through two separate processes.
2. The primary reason for this separation was the difference in the timing for data collection, rather irregular (most often 4 years) for the pan-European reporting and regular (5 years) for the FRA reporting. The cycles of the pan-European reporting were coinciding with those of the ministerial conferences, organized on an irregular basis.
3. Both processes are entirely independent in terms of their mandates and management; however, their implementation is carried out with the involvement of the same organizations (ECE, FAO and Forest Europe).
4. As a result, countries in the pan-European region had to report twice for the same reference years, which posed additional burden on national correspondents, reviewers and secretariats of international organizations. Moreover, data often was inconsistent and confusing (two separate sets) in terms of its use and dissemination.
5. The three secretariats (Liaison Unit Bratislava, the FRA Team and the Joint ECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section), in cooperation with experts and national correspondents, worked to harmonize the systems to the extent possible (definitions, classifications, reference years, reporting processes); however, they were not in a position to address the major drawback – uncoordinated reporting cycles.

II. Opportunity

6. The convergence of the next cycles of the pan-European and global reporting, the results of which are expected to be published in 2020, provides a unique opportunity for the further integration of the data collection processes.
7. Building on the experience gained from past cooperation, the potential of the network of secretariats, experts and national correspondents and the capacity of the (ECE, FAO and Forest Europe) it is possible to develop an advanced integrated joint data collection system.
8. The system should satisfy the needs of all participating partners and be based on agreed rules and distributions of roles and responsibilities.

III. Proposal

9. The next pan-European national data collection on forests and forest management will be carried out in full coordination with the data collection process for the global Forest Resources Assessment 2020, including the continuation of the Collaborative Forest Resources Questionnaire (CFRQ).

10. The integrated data collection will be done jointly by ECE, FAO and Forest Europe, through the Liaison Unit Bratislava, the FRA Team and the Joint ECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section.
11. The data will be collected through the interactive platform developed and hosted by FAO, which will include the main reporting module (same for all countries) and an additional component for the remaining pan-European indicators (for Forest Europe countries).
12. ECE, FAO and Forest Europe will work together on the development of reporting formats, terms, definitions, classifications and guidelines for the 2020 reporting.
13. National data will be collected through the same (for both processes) national correspondents, assisted in their work by experts designated by ECE, FAO and Forest Europe.
14. The tentative schedule for the 2020 integrated data collection include:
 - (a) Launch of reporting – January 2018;
 - (b) Deadline for national reporting – end of June 2018;
 - (c) Completion of the national data review – end of September 2018;
 - (d) Completion of the verification of data reported through International Data Providers – end of November 2018;
 - (e) Compilation of datasets – end of 2018;
 - (f) Public release of the joint interactive database – tbd.
15. ECE, FAO and Forest Europe will work jointly to provide support to national correspondents and on the organization of technical meetings, including the:
 - (a) 5th meeting of the ECE/FAO ToS on Monitoring SFM, Tromsø, Norway, 22 to 24 May 2017;
 - (b) Expert Consultation on FRA, Joensuu, Finland, 12 to 16 June 2017;
 - (c) Forest Europe Advisory Group on SoEF 2020, 27 to 28 September 2017.
 - (d) Global workshop for national correspondents, January 2018;
 - (e) Regional workshop for national correspondents, Geneva, Switzerland, 18 to 20 April 2018.
16. Data collected will be made available to ECE, FAO and Forest Europe for their use and the production of their own or joint outputs; the complete dataset (regional or global) will be released together with the global database.
17. Data collected will be disseminated through the FRA data platform. Data of all countries will be available on the FAO website, while Forest Europe and ECE will disseminate data reported by their member States through their own websites. The logos/names of ECE, FAO and Forest Europe will always have to be displayed on any website or publication presenting the data.
18. The detailed description of roles and responsibilities will be agreed through a separate document. The agreement will be valid for the 2020 data collection process; any continuation would require a new agreement.

IV. Conclusion

19. This enhanced coordination of data collection will result in a significant reduction of national reporting burden, the optimization of secretariats' resources, an improved completeness of data, and the enhanced credibility and visibility of the data.

Annex II

Proposed Global Core Set of forest related indicators, for consideration by CPF, as of 19 June 2017

I. Background

1. The process to agree on a global core set of forest related indicators has been moving forward from a side meeting at the World Forestry Conference in Durban and culminating at an organization-led initiative in Rome in November 2016, which proposed a core set for wider consultation. Since then a first meeting of the CPF Task Force and an online consultation took place, as well as an Expert Consultation on FRA2020, which discussed the Global Core Set. This paper presents the latest version of the Global Core Set, taking account of views expressed at all of these consultations. This paper does not repeat the background material on objectives and linkages with high level policy commitments which were presented at some length in the background paper to the Expert Consultation.

2. It is now for the CPF, possibly through its task force, to take a final decision on the Global Core Set, and how it should be implemented by CPF members. Thereafter, the CPF should present the results to UNFF13, as requested by UNFF12.

3. Many participants in the consultations agree that there is now a unique window of opportunity, when the high level policy commitments have been made and the reporting systems are being put in place, but are not yet finally fixed. There is still the possibility to adjust definitions, reporting mechanisms and timetables to streamline processes and reduce the reporting burden, by applying the Global Core Set. All major players have expressed their willingness to cooperate, within their own mandates. However, this window of opportunity is closing rapidly: by the end of 2017, it will no longer be possible to modify the reporting systems being put in place, notably for FRA2020 and the SDGs, but also for UNFF, CBD and others. Formal approval by the CPF, of the Global Core Set, as well as agreement on its implementation, notably reporting responsibilities, is therefore urgent.

II. Proposed Global Core Set of forest-related indicators

4. Set out below is the Proposed Global Core Set, taking account of the many constructive comments made in a wide variety of consultations, up to mid-June 2017. It has been renumbered, dropping the references to indicators which have not been maintained. If CPF members wish to track the changes made during the last stage of the process, the annex to the Expert Consultation report keeps these references, as well as noting changes made during the Expert Consultation.

| | Global Core Set | Unit | Comments |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Forest area net change rate | per cent | Same wording as SDG 15.1.1. Sub-indicator of SDG 15.2.1. Combines trends for natural and planted forest, so could be misleading (see proposed new indicator 19) |
| 2 | Proportion of forest area located within legally established protected areas | per cent | Sub-indicator of SDG 15.2.1. Refers also to Aichi T11. Note: forest loss outside protected areas will increase share of protected areas in total forest area |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | Above-ground biomass stock in forest | tonnes | Sub-indicator of SDG 15.2.1. Monitors overuse of wood supply as drop in above ground biomass indicates harvests + other damage are greater than increment, possibly as a result of unsustainable forest management |
| 4 | Forest area designated and/or managed for protection of soil, water, infrastructure and managed natural resources | ha | Only indicator of protective role of forests. Challenge to define “designated and/or managed” as all forests have some protective role Make consistent with final text of FRA2020 concerning management objectives |
| 5 | Employment related to the forest sector | Number FTE | Include in addition to “forestry and logging” as defined by ISIC, wood and paper industries, plus (estimates of?) forest-related research, education, tourism, production of NWFP, as well as subsistence/informal employment |
| 6 | Existence of policies, strategies and institutions which explicitly encourage SFM | References (title, date URL etc.) | Same wording (“explicitly encourage”) as FRA2020. |
| 7 | Existence of national or sub-national forest assessment process | References (title, date URL etc.) | Full details on methods of NFI available from FRA2020 framework. Readers can make their own assessment of the scientific soundness of the method chosen, through FRA transparency. |
| 8 | Existence of a national or sub-national stakeholder platform | References (title, date URL etc.) | See FRA2020 definition of stakeholder platform |
| 9 | Proportion of forest area under a long-term forest management plan | per cent | Sub-indicator of SDG 15.2.1. See FRA2020 for definition of “long term forest management plan” |
| 10 | Forest area under an independently verified forest management certification scheme | ha | Sub-indicator of SDG 15.2.1. See FRA2020 for definition of “independently verified forest management certification scheme” |
| 11 | Volume of wood removals | m ³ | Only indicator of production function of forests. Ideally would be expanded to include NWFP, and possibly be expressed in value terms. However, both present significant technical problems (variety of NWFPs and lack of markets in many cases, difficulty of defining at what stage value should be assessed) |
| 12 | Existence of traceability system(s) for wood products | References (title, date, URL, state of development ⁴) | Response to commitment to increase “share of products from sustainably managed forests” (GFT 3.3) which cannot be monitored without a traceability system (also an important policy tool against trade in illegally logged products) Often traceability applies to legality, not sustainably sourced products, so caution needed in assessment. |

⁴ Operational, being developed, under consideration etc.

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13 | Proportion of forest area disturbed (or reword to gain consistency with FRA2020) | per cent of forest area | GFGT and Aichi refer to “resilience” and “adaptive capacity”, while the third thematic element refers to “health and vitality”. Well known issues linked with disturbance/damage: conceptual framework, aggregation of different types of disturbance, separating “normal” from “abnormal” disturbance etc. Need to be able to aggregate types of disturbance and follow trends. |
| 14 | Area of degraded forest | ha | GFGT, SDG, UNCCD and Aichi all refer to “degraded” lands, forests and ecosystems, so it is necessary to monitor trends for degraded forests. The challenge is to define “degraded”. Urgent to define and measure “forest degradation” in realistic way, adaptable to many different circumstances and types of degradation. A multi-axis approach might be useful, monitoring different ways in which forest functions diminished |
| 15 | Number of forest dependent people in extreme poverty | Number | The most specific commitment under GOF2 is to eradicate extreme poverty for all forest dependent people, although several challenges exist: first, to define “forest-dependent”, and then to collect the data. Needs urgent further work, on definition of “forest dependent people”, and then on survey methods which could be used. Then CPF to take policy decision on whether to pursue. |
| 16 | Financial resources from all sources for the implementation of sustainable forest management | \$ | The indicator repeats the wording of GOF 4, as trends in financing SFM must be monitored. Further work needed: what types of financing are covered ⁵ , and how is each defined and monitored, and how to distinguish financing “for the implementation of SFM” from other financing (does all investment in forestry contribute to SFM?) |
| 17 | Total supply of wood-based energy | MJ | Maintained despite lack of policy commitment on wood energy, as this is very important in both developing and developed countries, and potentially more important in green economy based on renewable energies. Include wood energy of all types and sources. |
| 18 | Net GHG sink/source of forests, and carbon storage in harvested wood products | t CO ₂ e ⁶ | Addresses forest sector’s role in mitigating climate change (GFGT 2.5), covering all greenhouse gases, not just CO ₂ UNFCCC guidelines should be followed, recognising that reporting obligations varied by countries and parameters |
| 19 | Change in area of primary forests | ha | Addresses Aichi T5, using FRA2020 terms |
| 20 | Number of threatened | number | New indicator of species diversity. Data may |

⁵ Target 4.2 specifies “public (national, bilateral, multilateral and triangular), private and philanthropic financing”.

⁶ Greenhouse gases in tons of CO₂ equivalent.

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| forest dependent species/trends in keystone/indicator species for forests | | be available from IUCN |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------|

III. Comments on the proposed Global Core Set and its implementation

5. With all indicators, analysis must take account of context, and national circumstances. In some cases, it may not be clear whether an increase or a decrease of the indicator is “sustainable”. In any case, the Global Core Set should be taken as a whole.

6. The set as a whole seems comprehensive and balanced, although rather longer than originally intended (20 indicators instead of 10-15). Each indicator is directly linked to one or more high level policy commitments, as set out in the annex table

7. It was pointed out that while many of the indicators addressed the status of the aspect covered, others addressed the policy response to the situation, in accordance with the Pressure/State/Response model used by OECD and many others. This is the case for indicators 6, 7, 8 and 12. In these cases, the effectiveness of the measures was of the utmost importance but international data collection processes are not in a position to make a judgement on this. However, the transparent presentation of references made it possible for each user to develop his or her own opinion on the effectiveness of the instruments presented.

8. Regional C&I processes had played a key role in developing the concepts underlying the Global Core Set, and might be involved in finalising and implementing the set. This applied especially to indicators addressed through the CFRQ mechanism.

9. It is important to prepare a narrative or rationale for each of the indicators, linking it to the high-level policy commitments (and possibly to the corresponding regional indicators, although that might be done by the C&I processes themselves), and outlining the significance of the information which would be collected

10. Some indicators require urgent work (by CPF task force?), on concepts and/or definitions before they are usable, but should nevertheless be in the GCS because of a strong policy commitment in those areas:

- 14 area of forest degradation
- 15 Number of forest dependent people in extreme poverty
- 16 Finance from all sources for implementing SFM

11. There should also be a “candidate list” of indicators/topics not yet suitable for inclusion in the Global Core Set, but which deserve further consideration, for possible inclusion in a revised list:

- Contribution of forests to food security (strong commitment, very difficult to monitor)
- Payment for forest ecosystem services (emerging issue, not yet “ripe”)
- Economic aspects of SFM⁷ (GFGT commitment 2.4 extremely wide, so difficult to measure)
- Social aspects of SFM (GFGT commitment 2.4 extremely wide, so difficult to measure)

⁷ For instance forest sector share of GDP, livelihoods/revenues from forests.

12. As regards data collection for the Global Core Set, the Expert Consultation identified the following as indicators for which FRA2020 would collect data:
- Forest area net change rate
 - Proportion of forest area located within legally established protected areas
 - Above ground biomass stock in forest
 - Forest area designated and/or managed for protection of soil, water, infrastructure and managed natural resources
 - Employment related to the forest sector
 - Existence of policies, strategies and institutions which explicitly encourage SFM
 - Existence of national or sub-national forest assessment process
 - Existence of national or sub-national stakeholder platform
 - Proportion of forest area under a long term forest management plan
 - Proportion of forest area under an independently verified forest management certification scheme
 - Volume of wood removals (through JFSQ)
 - Existence of a traceability system for wood products
 - Proportion of forest area disturbed
 - Change in area of primary forests
13. The CPF partners should agree as soon as possible on data collection responsibilities for the whole Global Core Set.
14. Next steps for the CPF.
15. To summarise, the CPF, possibly acting through its Task Force on the GCS, should:
- Finalise the Global Core Set of Forest-related indicators, building on the version set out above, which has emerged from several rounds of consultation with relevant communities
 - Complete associated work, in particular:
 - i. Address the conceptual and definition challenges for indicators 14, 15 and 16
 - ii. Prepare a narrative to accompany and explain the Core Set
 - iii. Draw up a candidate list of indicators which are not yet appropriate for inclusion in the list
 - Assign reporting responsibilities among CPF partners
 - Present the outcome to UNFF13
16. As other processes which would use the Global Core Set, including SDG reporting, FRA2020 and reporting under UNFI are already advancing according to their own schedules, it would be desirable that CPF complete steps 1-3 above by autumn 2017.

IV. Relation between GCS and policy commitments

| | Indicator | Thematic element | SDG | GFGT | Aichi |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Forest area net change rate | 1 | 15.1.1 15.2.1 | 1.1 1.3 | T5 T14 |
| 2 | Proportion of forest area located within legally established protected areas | 2 | 15.2.1 | 1.3 2.5 3.1 | T11 |
| 3 | Above-ground biomass stock in forest | 4 | 15.2.1 | 1.3 2.5 | T7 |
| 4 | Forest area designated and/or managed for protection of soil, water, infrastructure and managed natural resources | 5 | | 1.4 | |
| 5 | Employment related to the forest sector | 6 | | 2.4 | |
| 6 | Existence of policies, strategies and institutions which explicitly encourage SFM | 7 | | 5.1 5.3 5.4 | |
| 7 | Existence of national or sub-national forest assessment process | 7 | | 4.5 | |
| 8 | Existence of a national or sub-national stakeholder platform | 7 | | 5.3 6.3 | |
| 9 | Proportion of forest area under a long-term forest management plan | 7 | 15.2.1 | 1.3 3.2 | T7 |
| 10 | Forest area under an independently verified forest management certification scheme | 7 | 15.2.1 | 1.3 3.3 | |
| 11 | Volume of wood removals | 4 | | 2.4 | |
| 12 | Existence of traceability system(s) for wood products | 7 | | 3.3 5.2 | |
| 13 | Proportion of forest area disturbed (or reword to gain consistency with FRA2020) | 3 | | 1.4 | |
| 14 | Area of degraded forest | 3 | 15.3.1 | 1.3 | T15 |
| 15 | Number of forest dependent people in extreme poverty | 6 | | 2.1 | |
| 16 | Financial resources from all sources for the implementation of sustainable forest management | 7 | | 4.1 4.2 | |
| 17 | Total supply of wood-based energy | 4 | 7.2.1 | | |
| 18 | Net GHG sink/source of forests, and carbon storage in harvested wood products | 7 | | 1.2 2.5 | |
| 19 | Change in area of primary forests | 2 | | | T5 |
| 20 | Number of threatened forest dependent species/trends in keystone/indicator species for forests | 2 | | | T5 |

17. In addition: GCS 14 is linked to commitments under UNCCD. GCS 3 and 18 are linked to commitments under UNFCCC. It was pointed out that the level of commitment to report varied between UNFCCC parties and the relevant instruments.
