

**Integrated programme of work on forests and timber of the
UNECE Timber Committee and
the FAO European Forestry Commission**

**COMPILATION OF RESPONSES RECEIVED
As at 23 February 2004**

1. What should be the strategic objective of the integrated programme of the UNECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission, taking account of the needs of the region, inputs from other actors in the area, and the comparative advantages of the two partners?

(Canada)

The overall strategic objective identified during the last review of the integrated program of work and approved by the bureaux of both the Timber Committee and the European Forestry Commission remains valid. The strategic objectives would appear to continue to reflect the mandate and direction of both parent organizations. However, some refinement in the overall work program will require adjustments given the recent reduction in the level of professional staff.

(Finland)

The present mission is formulated as follows: " ... to contribute to the sustainable development of the forests and forest products sector, including services in the ECE region". This mission is reflected in the structure of the joint work programme.

– There is no need to revise or re-formulate the current core mission and objectives. Metla emphasises the role of UNECE/FAO in the international forest dialogue, both at regional and global levels. Especially, co-operation with MCPFE and contribution to SFM, through the information collected in the regional FRA, need to be stressed here.

Only a marginal proportion of the ECE resources is allocated to forest issues. In Metla's view this share could be increased. ECE could also be more active in the co-operation with the EU Commission. ECE could provide a readily available forum for many forest issues which at present are being debated within the Commission.

(France)

Remarques générales

le Comité du Bois, la Commission Européenne des Forêts, le Comité mixte OAA/CEE, le Groupe de travail mixte OAA/CEE/OIT, les huit équipes de spécialistes, sont peu connus dans l'administration forestière française. Et il y a souvent confusion entre ces différentes structures ;

le programme intégré Comité du Bois/Commission Européenne des Forêts n'est pas bien connu et pas valorisé en tant que tel ;

pourtant ces organismes ont 50 ans ; leur champ couvre la forêt, l'industrie forestière, le commerce et l'utilisation des produits forestiers ; ils font partie des rares enceintes où les sujets de main d'œuvre forestière ou de formation sont traités ;

le Comité du Bois attire chaque année des opérateurs économiques français, pour la discussion sur l'évolution du marché et ses perspectives ;

le partage des rôles avec MCPFE n'apparaît pas très clair : peut-on dire que MCPFE s'occupe plutôt de l'amont de la filière et le Comité du Bois de l'aval (ou bien que c'est une distinction politique/technique ?) ? Quelle est la place de la CEF ?

En résumé, ces organismes ont un rôle important de diffusion d'informations utiles aux décideurs, aux opérateurs économiques, aux propriétaires forestiers... mais qui pourrait

certainement être mieux valorisé.

Objectifs stratégiques

- remplir le mandat de la FAO et de la CEE dans la région : oui ;
- contribuer au dialogue forestier régional et partager les expériences : oui ;
- pays en transition : tenir compte de l'adhésion de 10 nouveaux pays à l'UE le 1er mai 2004 pour redéfinir cet objectif ;
- travailler avec des partenaires pour l'exécution de programmes : est-ce vraiment un objectif ou un moyen ? Peut-être à reformuler : «mettre en œuvre des programmes, avec des partenaires » ?

(Germany)

Germany presumes that both formal mandates and mission as described in Annex 1 of the secretariats letter will remain as they stand.

However more emphasis should lie on economic issues where FAO/ECE secretariat – especially with its Timber Committee – has its comparative advantages.

The knowledge on and the awareness of the roles that forest and forest industry sectors play in overall sustainable development should be raised.

(Hungary)

Thank to the open and transparent manner of the process and the wide participation in the first strategic review in 2001 there is little need to modify the strategic objective of the two sister bodies, and we evaluate the integrated programme of work that guides the realization of this objective as sufficiently effective and useful. (It should also be born in mind that the first review was well based on the experiences of several years of cooperation, and the past three years is a quite short period in strategic terms to generate strong needs for strategic changes. By other words, the frequency of strategic reviews needs some considerations as well, which may lead to the conclusion that such reviews are more effective if performed in 5-10 years intervals. Sufficient monitoring mechanisms can ensure the necessary fine-tuning in between two reviews.)

Taking into account the most recent developments of the international forestry dialogue, it would be useful to make it visible in the objective that the bodies contribute to the implementation and further development of sustainable forest management (SFM), as a conceptual and practical response of forestry to the challenges of sustainable development. This could be displayed as one element of either the “MANDATE” or the “MISSION”.

As for the “STRATEGIES”, it deserves some consideration that in the light of the recent changes, especially the accession of 8 CITs to the EU, the focus of the attention may shift towards the newly independent states, therefore efforts could rightly promote their integration to the ECE region. With this change of formulation the differences in the membership of the two bodies could not have any effects on implementation, and “STRATEGIES” would be fully in accord with “MISSION”.

(Ireland)

There is no need to change the mandate. Section 3 of Annex 1 describes the strategies very well. The strategic objective should be to ensure the sustainability of forestry as a producer of timber and non-timber benefits.

(New Zealand)

Comments: In my view the strategic objective for the integrated programme needs to strongly correlate to where the Timber Committee and the European Forestry Commission have clearly identified added-value contributions to make which are not being undertaken by any other pan-Europe or International agency. From my remote New Zealand perspective implementing this strategic objective clearly appears to strongly be the case for Work Area 1: Markets and Statistics for within Europe and especially with the countries in transition and in Work Area 2: Forest Resource Assessment for the industrialised countries of the ECE region and the three non-ECE largely temperate industrialised countries (Australia, Japan and New Zealand) who have participated in the TBFR programme since 1990. I believe that in Work Area 3: European Forest sector Outlook Studies the Timber Committee does have some contribution to make but I temper this by noting that other institutes (such as the European Forest Institute or the OECD) may be better positioned and resourced to progress the Outlook Studies at a quicker pace than what appears to be happening with the current EFSOS. I would question whether the Timber Committee does have a comparative advantage with Work Area 4: Technology, Management and Training and I have seen little output from this work area over the years I have been associated with ECE Timber Section. The information dissemination role undertaken by the ECE Timber Committee following the December 1999 windstorms may fall within this work area and from afar, I was impressed with the media releases that were electronically distributed at the time and the information they conveyed. In Work Area 5: Policy and Cross-sectoral issues I do consider that the ECE Timber Committee has some comparative advantages and should maintain resources to ensure that it can contribute expertise here, especially in monitoring developments in the countries in transition and with the global dialogue on forests. So, in essence the Strategic Objective doesn't need to depart too much from the current one but should focus on playing to the strengths of the present arrangements: namely being seen as a neutral forum for European forestry issues and noting strongly that the countries which make up the ECE include most of the developed temperate and boreal forested countries which come within Annex I to the UNFCCC.

(Norway)

General remark

The first strategic review, in 2000-2001, was carried out as a comprehensive process. Norway was, and still is quite satisfied with the result. In our view there has not been any considerable shifts in political priorities, or other particular circumstances that require major changes in the strategic direction of the programme of work for the next period.

Answer to question 1

We have no concrete proposal for how to formulate a strategic objective. It might be more pertinent to define a strategic objective of the Timber Committee and the European Forestry Commission rather than of the integrated work programme as such, as the programme is an implementation instrument of the two organisations.

The objective of the integrated programme of work should be to realise the mandates and goals of the ECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission through concrete and coordinated activities and actions. The programme of work is the main instrument of the Committee and the Commission, and should promote synergies and cooperation between them, as well as with other regional and international bodies, and promote SFM in the region.

The strategies agreed upon at the last strategic review in 2001 are still relevant.

(Romania)

To add

Continuing the work already performed and promoting new aspects of the sustainable development in the forestry sector in order to fulfil economic, social and environmental needs in the region.

I would like to make some suggestions for the specific objectives of the integrated programme of the UNECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission:

-related to region needs:

- Monitor, promote and provide guidance for the sound use of wood/forest resources in the region taking into account avoiding and limiting unsustainable patterns of production and consumption
- Intensify the promotion of indicators of sustainability in forest management (all data used in reporting to TC/EFC by member countries and organisations could be expressed related to indicators of sustainability)
- promote the increase of the forest cover area in the sensitive parts of the region in accordance with FCCC, CCD and CBD
- consider of the work force in the forest and timber product sector as well as in rural areas, especially in countries in transition (partnership with ILO)
- intensify the promotion of public-private partnership in forestry
- continue providing assistance for countries in transition

- addressed to inputs from other actors in the area:

- intensify monitoring of the competition of wood/forest products with other resources and materials
- promote the sound use of wood/forest products as a renewable and environmentally friendly resource in the present-day competitive economic environment
- continue monitoring the forest products flow in the region, including bioenergy/“green energy” produced from wood
- monitor illegal logging.

- addressed to the comparative advantages of the two partners:

- actively contribute to the global forest dialogue and cross-sectoral forest related challenges
- share responsibility with forestry sector partners and all stakeholders

address key environmental challenges, from biodiversity protection to renewable energy and provide models for future action

(Slovakia)

Strategic objective of the integrated programme expresses sufficiently and correctly all the intentions consequential from the mandate of both UNECE and FAO. It could be considered to extend present definition about these issues:

- Reinforce position of forestry and forest products sector in relation to related sectors and their policies on EU and national level.
- Contribute to improvement political, legal and economic framework of forestry sector with the target to strengthen its sustainable development.

- Provide INTERFACE for the most important political processes (e.g. MCPFE, Montreal Process, UN IPFF, FCC, CBD), sub-regions of the ECE (EU-non-EU-CEE, North America, other CEE states), intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and programmes. It would mean to (i) utilise better traditional mandates, competence and skills, (ii) bridge currently fragmented and not quite transparent situation, overlaps and inconsistencies among political processes, intergovernmental and non-governmental programmes, (iii) to be involved in preparation of concerted activities and their coordination in cost-efficient ways, eliminating duplicities and existing/potential incompatibility.

(Sweden)

General Comment:

As to our suggestions for the Joint programme , the main work areas would be four:

1. Markets and Statistics including Forest Resource Assessment.
2. Long term regional analysis of the forest and forest products sector as well as of the wood-based energy production.
3. Support to countries in transition, in particular non-EU countries
4. Policy and cross-sectoral issues.

It is suggested that the present work area 4 Technology, management and Training be abolished or transformed into the work area on Support to countries in transition. We would also question the need to maintain the Joint Committee but that might depend on the interest of the ILO to continue support it. Eitherwise the guidance of the activities of the work areas 3 and 4 could be done by the Timber Committee and European Forestry Commission or through their joint Bureau. A third option in case the ILO drops out of the cooperation could be to establish a Joint UNECE/FAO working party on work areas 3 and 4.

For work areas 1 and 2 we suggest to maintain the Joint UNECE/FAO working party on Forest Economics and Statistics. We also want to retain the established cooperation with processes like the MCPFE and other regional processes outside Europe, with the ITTO and also with other forest related bodies even if not all are mentioned in the paper. The need for cooperation with civil society , NGO:s of various kinds and industry is also of course of great importance.

Sweden's Answer to Q1:

The UNECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission shall in the ECE region promote and support sustainable development of the forest and forest products sector and also the forests' contribution to the global climate work.

(UK)

Strategic Objective

- i. Although the intentions within the strategic objective may be sustainable forestry in the ECE region, this is not evident from the text. Sustainable forestry should be mentioned in the strategic objective.
- ii. The strategic objective should enable the Timber Committee to tease out and demonstrate the links between timber marketing and over-arching issues/themes such as

renewable resources and energy efficiency, illegal logging and illegal activities in the forest sector.

- iii. The strategic objective should enable the Timber Committee to explore technical/policy innovations that will maintain or generate new demand in the future.

(USA)

The Strategic Review completed in 2001 has provided an excellent foundation for moving forward and adjusting the Strategic Objective into the future. The Mission, “The UNECE Timber Committee and the FAO European Forestry Commission will contribute to the sustainable development of the forest and forest products sector, including services, in the ECE region”, is sufficiently broad to provide a great deal of flexibility to the Integrated Programme of Work (IPW) of the TC/EFC. It has been noted by some that the Mission may be overly broad. The question then becomes how should the IPW contribute to the overall effort and how much of a lead should the IPW have?

The IPW must recognize, as it has in the past, its responsibility to provide a forum for leadership in accruing, dispersing, and utilizing the resources of all members to achieve the Mission of the TC/EFC. The unique membership and joint interactions of the TC and the EFC enable member countries to communicate across a wide range of issues while maintaining individual responsibility for their own human and environmental resources.

In its 2000 Strategic Review, the United States noted that “the core mandate remains valid; however, it is somewhat vague, and offers little guidance as to how it is likely to be expressed in terms of priorities and the program of work. Although such vagueness is generally useful, the need to define the comparative advantage of the Secretariat, the fact of scarce resources, and the need to set priorities suggest the need for greater clarity and specificity.”

Since 2000, the growth in interest in the overall Mission, not just by those within the UNECE-TC and the FAO-EFC, has vastly expanded beyond the membership. How then does the Secretariat accomplish greater clarity and specification?

The IPW needs to ensure that the entire forestry and forest products community, not just the membership, is utilizing the efforts of the TC/EFC. While it may not be responsible of the TC or EFC to direct policy matters, it is entirely proper for the TC/EFC to be present to supply information and resources. Responsibility comes with being in a leadership roll. The IPW can activate and utilize all of its resource to provide a wider and better understood situation of the forestry and forest products sectors and services, so that more informed decisions are made by forest practitioners, customers and policymakers

(IGO INBAR)

Strategic objectives should concentrate on the areas of member countries preferences and comparative advantages of the ECE/FAO Joint Team, where it could provide unique quality services leaving other areas to partners and subcontractors. Areas of comparative advantages include wide recognition of the Team, its interdisciplinary character, impartiality, holistic approach and flexible working methods.

Unfortunately ECE/FAO agenda does not mention two major processes started in the forestry since mid 1990s: globalization and ecosystem management paradigm shift. This problem should be fixed and the issues should be properly addressed. The processes are to be measured, monitored and consequences should be carefully studied. It is recommended to work on the issues together with the IUFRO WFSE (World Forest, Society and Environment) team and the other interested organizations.

Strategic objectives should also include better reflection and recognition of the increasing role of NTFP in ecosystem management practices.

(R. Vlosky - Leader of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing)

Maximize the complementary competencies of the two organizations to develop and deliver world-class actionable information to stakeholders in client countries. This will require frequent meaningful communication, coordination and cooperation between the two bodies.

(JC – Hoefle and Salvignol)

Contribute to and promote sustainable forest management (SFM) by putting policy discussions into practice! ← important :

Note: All elements of SFM must be considered.

Considering the opinion of our colleague Paul EFTHIMIOU, the JC subjects area have to be clearly specified :

*"the primary focus and the key words of our JC refer to :
Forest Operations, Forest Engineering, Forest Workers/Operators,
Working Methods, Workers Education & Training, Ergonomics, which
have to be studied, developed, rationalized, coordinated and optimized
in the framework of a continuously pursued Sustainable Forest Management."*

2. What major work areas should be covered by the integrated programme of work?**(Canada)**

Over the past several years, all five of the work areas within the integrated program of work have been considered to be high priorities. However, the current priorities need to be reviewed in the context of reduced staffing levels supported by the parent organizations. Accordingly, the following order of the five work areas reflect my priorities:

- a. Markets and Statistics
- b. Forest Resource Assessment
- c. Policy and Cross Sectoral Issues
- d. Technology, Management and Training
- e. European Forest Sector Outlook Studies (EFSOS)

In recognition of the reduction in staff, it would appear necessary to eliminate the work activities related to the EFSOS studies. While the EFSOS studies provide important information on the development of the European forests and forest sector, they are not entirely representative of the entire country membership of the ECE TC and EFC. If these are considered necessary by members countries, then those countries should provide a budget to allow this work to be carried out.

(Finland)

From the viewpoint of Metla, these are the priority areas: 1. Markets and statistics; 2. Forest resource assessment; 3. European forest sector outlook studies and 5. Policy and cross-sectoral issues.

Markets and statistics are at the core of UNECE/FAO activities, and their position should be maintained, perhaps even strengthened. Since late 1990s, significant progress was made in joint data collection, data sharing, validation etc., mainly thanks to the IWG.

FRA is the most comprehensive source of information on the forest resource, contributing also quantitative indicators to SFM. Metla has regarded Efsos as one of the key projects in the work programme. Finland has provided staff and funding to Efsos. The present situation is far from satisfactory, as the expected results clearly overstretch available resources. It would be necessary to put more focus on Efsos. If this cannot be achieved, Efsos should be

streamlined so that it concentrates on programme element 3.1 (Outlook for European forest products markets). Sub-project 3.1 is to a large extent based on statistics and market analysis, so it might even be worth considering the transfer of 3.1 into work area 1.

From the viewpoint of Metla, work area no. 4 (technology, management and training) is less important. It might be appropriate to cut resources here, thus making it possible to concentrate them more on statistics and the regional FRA. In work area 4, possible coordination with IUFRO activities might be possible.

(France)

- marché et statistiques, évaluation des ressources forestières, études perspectives : ces trois domaines sont suivis par le Groupe de travail mixte ; avec la fin des études EFSOS, il ne devrait plus rester que deux domaines ;
- technologie, gestion et formation : ce domaine est suivi par le Comité mixte. Son programme est divisé en trois sous-programmes assez équilibrés. Il serait peut-être plus clair d'en faire des domaines d'activité à part entière ;
- politique et sujets trans-sectoriels : RAS.

(Germany)

Working area 1: Markets and Statistics

General remark: In the light of the recent developments inter alia the political resolutions of the MCPFE in Vienna 2003 the aspect of economic issues both in forestry and in forest industries should be emphasised.

Details concerning the respective program elements (amendments are underlined):

- 1.2 Analysis of markets for forests products and forest services; plantation as possible supplementary raw material sources for products and energy purposes and its impact on the markets
- 1.4 Monitoring of markets for certified products, analysis of procurement policies, analysis of trade related private sector activities
- 1.6 Information network, activities of team of specialists, description of the use of wood for energy purposes and activities (e.g. subsidies) to support energy generation of wood.

Working area 2: Forest Resources Assessment

This area should take into account recent decisions to focus on global FRA. The TBFRA expert group, explicitly should be maintained.

Working area 3: European Forest Sector Outlook Studies

With the experience of rapid political and economic changes in the recent past the forecast periods should be shortened (preferably short- and medium term outlook studies).

The system should become more dynamic and flexible and thus allowing easily modification of the results in case of necessary changes of basic assumptions.

Working area 4: Technology, Management and Training

Given the increasing importance of privatisation and increased entrepreneurship in forestry a new programme element "forest extension" is proposed. In balance, the existing programme element 4.1 and 4.2 on forest technology and forest management could be merged.

Working area 5: Policy and cross-sectoral issues

The economic importance of the entire cluster forest and forest industries should be highlighted.

(Hungary)

The five major work areas as stated in the current programme of work should remain unchanged in the coming years. The decision to focus the attention on these areas is justified by the results of the work of the last years, and UNECE/FAO is well recognized by its contribution in almost all these fields.

(Ireland)

The five work areas identified in Annex 2 (market and statistics, forest resource assessment, forest sector outlook studies, technology, management and training and policy and cross-sectoral issues) are complete and do not need to be modified.

(New Zealand)

Comments: My comments made to Question 1 would indicate that the integrated programme of work should primarily focus on Work Areas 1, 2 and 5 with some scaling back or reduction of efforts in Work Areas 3 and 4.

(Norway)

In our view, we should retain the five existing work areas also for the next period. The relative priority of the different areas, as well as the resource allocation between them should be examined.

Based on the mandates and the comparative advantages of the organisations, we think the work area 4: “Technology, management and training“ should have lower priority than the other work areas.

Further, we wish to underline that the work area 3: EFSOS will move into a new stage in the next period. Most of the existing activities in the work programme will be completed in short time. We think there should be outlook study activities (i.a. thematic analysis) also in the next period, and it might be appropriate to keep the work area in the work programme. The resources allocated to this area should though in any case be reduced.

Activities and outputs under work area 1: markets and statistics has been modified the last years. From focusing mainly on annual statistics on production, trade and prices of traditional forest products, there has been a movement towards more trend studies as well as discussions and analysis of market developments with emphasis on important thematic issues on the policy and market arenas. We strongly welcome this shift and wish the work area to be further developed in this direction.

Emerging issues of high political interest should be included in the programme. At this stage we wish to highlight the following issues:

- illegal activities, law enforcement and governance - with a focus on illegal logging and related trade
- wood energy
- markets for non-wood goods and services

These issues could be incorporated into existing work areas (markets and statistics, policy and cross-sectoral issues)

In general, high priority should be given to activities that promote synergies between the ECE/FAO and the MCPFE and its work programme established in October 2003.

(Romania)

All included **work areas** should be covered by the integrated programme of work: (policy and cross-sectoral issues; market and statistics; forest resources assessment; technology, management and training, forest sector outlook studies) but prioritisation should be revised.

(Sweden)

The major work areas to be covered by the integrated programme are suggested to be:

1. Statistics including Forest Resource Assessment. Focus on:
 - Forest resources and the use and management of these resources
 - Production and trade of wood raw material (for industrial use and for energy production), sawnwood, pulp and paper.
2. Long-term regional analysis of the forest and the forest products sector as well as of the wood-based energy production (e.g. EFSOS, structural changes in forestry, forest industry and wood-based energy production)
3. Support to countries in transition, in particular non-EU countries.
4. Policy and cross-sectoral issues. Focus on:
 - Contribution to and co-ordination with regional and global bodies/processes, such as MCPFE, EU, non-European regional forest processes and CPF members.
 - Gender issues

It should be noted that the present work area "Technology, Management and Training" is suggested to be deleted. We believe that most of the relevant work needed can be carried out through actions directed towards countries in transition, both within the work area suggested above and through foreign aid programs of different donors.

(Slovakia)

Present working areas, their objectives and programme elements cover all significant tools of sustainable development such as: forestry policy, legislation, management of forest resources, their assessment, outlook studies, market and statistics. In the scope of listed working areas should be observed for example also these issues:

- Certification of forests and forest products
- Assessment of public beneficial forest functions and trade with them; relations between productive and public beneficial functions, mainly biodiversity conservation,
- Biomass as an alternative energy
- Public relations

The traditional work areas could be complemented also by (i) an Integrated Information Platform and (ii) Interface for the most important forest-, timber- and trade- related intergovernmental political processes, sub-regions, the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and programmes.

(UK)

- i. The 5 major work areas are appropriate but the links between them could be strengthened.
- ii. The need to define and estimate the volume of illegal timber arising from forests in the ECE region and the economic impact of this should be incorporated into the major work areas.
- iii. The ability to take a sideways look at other sectors such as agriculture and competition from other materials should be covered in the major work areas.

- iv. Work area 2 (forest resources): should add something about links with indicator processes (especially MCPFE), and review whether it is still desirable to include Australia, New Zealand and Japan.
- v. Work area 3 (EFSOS): should include a requirement to consider economic-related social data such as trends in forest recreation and in forest related tourism as well as environmental benefits.
- vi. Work area 3 (EFSOS): more explicit reference to the role of forestry in integrated (rather than sectoral) development. Forestry should no longer be seen as an industry operating in isolation to its own agenda. This is important, for example, in the context of CAP reform and the EU Rural Development Plans.
- vii. Work area 5 (policy and cross-sector work): policy analysis should be extended to include policy appraisal and evaluation.

(USA)

The IPW has supported work in five major areas: Market and statistics, forest resource assessments, forest sector outlook studies, technology, management and training, and policy and cross-sectoral issues. While the IPW has done an admirable job in all five areas, consideration should be given to a prioritization of the areas of work. We strongly support continuation of work in all five areas, encouraging a prioritization toward accurate and reliable data and forecasting in the areas of assessments and outlook studies and a high prioritization for capacity building and support and technical involvement input for policy and cross-sectoral issues.

The recently published UNECE/FAO Forest Products Annual Market Analysis, 2002-2004, includes a new special chapter covers the policy implications of forest products market developments in 2002 and 2003, with topics addressed including forest law enforcement governance and trade (FLEGT), certification of sustainable forest management, policies for sound use of wood, industrial development policies and structural oversupply, climate change policy, wood energy policy and trade policy. All of these areas of concern to the IPW, and care has been taken to ensure that the IWP is not proposing policies but rather to forward much needed information to policy and decision makers. Continued similar efforts are responsible undertakings by the IPW.

(IGO INBAR)

Joint Questionnaire should be amended to include certain NFTP

FRA should remain as a priority area in the view of FRA2005

Total work area seems to be too large for the ECE/FAO small Joint Secretariat. A solution would likely include staff increasing, concentrating limited resources on key issues, outsourcing and combination of the above methods.

(R. Vlosky - Leader of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing)

The TC can not be “all things to all people”. Accordingly, a careful and honest self-reflection needs to be done to identify what can be provided effectively rather than providing mediocre outputs across a broad spectrum of areas. Generally, the current work areas are appropriate. The program review needs to determine if in fact all areas are being addressed and supported. The key is to be the premier entity to provide information and support in the areas that the TC focuses on. Leave the others to other entities that are better suited to do so.

(JC – Hoefle and Salvignol)

The parent bodies might concentrate on data collection, exchange of information and (support of) policy formulation.

The mandate of the JC rather emphasises to put policy for SFM into practice through:

- Instruments for the management of forests (information systems, management plans, organisation of forest enterprises...)
- Optimisation of operations (silvicultural operations, harvesting of timber and non-timber forest products, dealing with forest fires...)
- Human resources development (training and further education (life long training), occupational safety and health) and social aspects of forestry (women in forestry, contractors, participation, partnerships...)

These activities are also important for and directed to countries in transition.

It seems to be a specific problem for the JC that the relevance of human resources development and of optimal operations are underestimated!

Practically there are no permanent activities. The programme of the Joint Committee is rather continuously renewed according to member countries' needs, priorities and topicality of themes. It strictly follows the priorities set by the parent bodies.

3. What should be its main activities and outputs, taking account of the strategic objective and availability of resources?

(Canada)

Based on the established priorities identified above as a, b, c, it is considered that these work items should be continued for the duration of the period covered by the 2004 strategic review. These activities should be confirmed during the strategic review and annually by the bureaux.

Activities currently undertaken in support of Technology, Management and Training, despite being undertaken jointly with the ILO, have a limited appeal to some non-European countries. Information on forest technology and forest management are considered to be the highest priority area within the program of work. The training of forest workers is probably best delivered by others.

(Finland)

In general, the expected outputs and the available resources are not in balance. Therefore the conclusion is that UNECE/FAO should focus on core activities and drop those where it does not have the best expertise. Programme elements of highest priority: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 3.1.

As far as the delegation of outputs are concerned, some re-delegation might be possible between UNECE/FAO and Eurostat. For example, could Eurostat play a greater role in the activities intended for countries in transition (e.g. capacity building)? Phare/Tacis funding is certainly available for at least statistical work.

(France)

Activités

les sujets d'actualité, les sujets émergents, doivent avoir toute leur place : exploitation illégale et commerce lié, PCI, certification, rémunération des services environnementaux, etc...

l'UE à 25 Etats membres regroupera plus de la moitié des pays européens : une attention particulière doit être portée aux sujets communautaires : FLEGT, stratégie forestière, etc...

la question d'un programme de travail commun avec MCPFE mérite d'être étudiée de près, pour éviter les duplications et assurer une meilleure visibilité régionale.

Produits attendus

- le mandat est de diffuser de l'information utile, bien sûr après l'avoir collectée, analysée et partagée :

- études lourdes : EFSOS...
- compte rendus d'ateliers, de séminaires ;
- notes aux décideurs, sur des thèmes identifiés ;
- lettre d'information périodique.

- la question de la traduction de tous ces textes en français (et dans les autres langues officielles des Nations Unies), dans un délai raisonnable, nous semble très importante. A titre d'exemple, le rapport de la 61e session du Comité du Bois, qui s'est tenue à Genève du 7 au 10 octobre 2003 a été disponible dès le 31 octobre en anglais, mais seulement début 2004 en français (sauf erreur).

(Germany)

Outputs should be global dialogue on forests through bodies such as the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe and the European Forestry Commission as well as reports and statistics. I suggest a monthly email bulletin that would highlight and summarise reports.

Continue as before and as described in the formal mandate but more emphasis on the kind of outputs (dissemination and PR on results).

(Hungary)

We see potentials for increasing the efficiency by slight changes within some major work areas.

- In Work area 1 "Markets and statistics" 1.4 Monitoring of markets for certified forest products can be merged with 1.1 and 1.2
- In Work area 2 "Forest resource assessment" the role to be played in connection with C&I for SFM can be clarified further. Within the region two C&I processes are relevant: the Montreal process and the MCPFE. There are two options here:
 - The mandate of improving concepts can be transferred to the processes themselves (as it happened so far with contribution from UNECE/FAO), so the main role remains supplying data, not only for forest resources but for a much wider set of C&I
 - UNECE/FAO may play a more substantial role in conceptual development building on the expertise represented by its teams of specialists and networks of national correspondents, but such decision will immediately have resource implications on the secretariat's side
- In work area 5 "Policy and cross-sectoral issues" increasing emphasis can be put on the cross-sectoral issues (trade, energy, environment, labour) building on the lucky situation, that Geneva hosts a number of international institutions which are or may be linked in a way or other to forestry issues. The work programme can motivate such cross-sectoral dialogue and cooperation

(Ireland)
(no reply)

(New Zealand)

Comments: The main outputs should be the timely dissemination of neutral and authoritative quantitative information from activities relating to data collection and analysis in the forestry sectors of the ECE and other industrialised countries in the temperate and boreal regions. This information must meet the highest possible standards associated with international best practice so that it provides leadership to other regional forestry commissions. Whether the Timber Committee needs to involve itself with analysis and tracking the evolution of ECE country's forestry policies is a moot point but if by doing so this ensures balanced views come through at other international levels such as the UN Forum on Forestry retaining capacity here will help facilitate the global dialogue on forests.

(Norway)
(no reply)

(Romania)

The main **activities and outputs**, taking account of the strategic objective and availability of resources could be maintained except for those related to failed teams (if the case). Additional activities concerning the new objectives/aspects (and related outputs), should be incorporated after debating proposals in the final stage of the strategic review.

(Sweden)

The main activities and outputs should be as today with publications (on paper and on Internet), seminars, workshops etc. However, user-friendly programs for interactive compiling of statistics from data bases should be developed.

(Slovakia)

The main activities and outputs can remain as they are now however with proposed extension by those items which are listed under previous item (2), especially information and consultation platform for the related inter-governmental political processes, sub-regions intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and programmes in the CEE region.

(UK)

- i. Changes made to the strategic objectives and major work areas will need to filter through to achieve appropriate, relevant and useful outputs. Until the final details of the work areas are agreed it is difficult to make worthwhile comments. However the recent changes to the Market Statement and the introduction of Executive Summary Reports etc, including the speed with which they are posted on the web site, have all been welcome developments since the first Strategic Review.
- ii. Outputs from Teams of Specialists and the usefulness of the outputs are not always evident. Perhaps a report that identifies the possible uses for the results of the work and that shows the work has been worthwhile and achieved what it set out to achieve may alleviate some of the tensions in this area.

(USA)

We commend the secretaries for its continued ambitious schedule of work. Members recognize the limitations of the staff resources and should recognize the ability of the staff to function as facilitators of information and resources. Greater utilization of and emphasis on

Teams of Specialists communications and outputs could stretch staff resources, thus utilizing extended resources.

The statistical outputs provide a balanced view of the region that is most difficult to replicate. Data on production, prices, trade flows and market prospects is vital to the industries involved. Likewise, the growing ability to measure biodiversity and sustainability and to provide policy background in such areas is often understated, although widely available in packets of information. Involvement in all of the above is seen as responsible management for the IWP.

In reference to data and other outputs as recommended above, the IWP should work toward ensuring that all member countries participate fully in the outputs. At this time, participation is less than complete, leaving many voids in the data and background information. To the extent that this reflects a need for capacity building in some member countries, voids should be identified and partnership built to close the voids.

(IGO INBAR)

With the currently limited resources problems of overstretching are likely to aggravate. Preference should be given to increase resources and budget to accommodate new topics instead of reducing resources and dropping current topics, in which Secretariat has gained unique experience.

(R. Vlosky - Leader of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing)

The key constraint is (non) availability of resources. As mentioned elsewhere in my comments, the outputs and activities need to be commensurate with what is important, the willingness of participants to deliver the goods, funding and resiliency to modify priorities as conditions change.

(JC – Hoefle and Salvignol)

Activities and outputs (Relevance of the programme: countries' priorities, regional and global forestry debate):

- Exchange of information for topics related to SFM and relevant to member countries (including countries in transition) through seminars, workshops and publication of results (reports of meetings with conclusion and recommendations, proceedings)
- Presentation of outstanding examples as benchmarks
- Demonstration of the state of the art (e.g. for road construction, harvesting operations).
- Clarification of and contribution to solution of problems through teams of specialists (e.g. participation in forestry; partnerships in forestry)
- Establishment of networks (FORWORKNET; EDUFOREST)
- Cooperation (e.g. with IUFRO, EFI, IUCN) and support of events (e.g. Forest Engineering Conference in Sweden, meeting of KWF in Germany) as far and whenever possible to reach optimal synergies.
- Major contributions to work programme of MCPFE

The results and outputs of the work of the Joint Committee have to be disseminated and taken up by member countries. For example, the JC operated as:

- Initiator for safety campaigns in France and Switzerland,
- Initiator for the development of the "Code of Best Forest Practice" and of "Biodiversity Guidelines" in Ireland

4. What methods of work should it employ?

(Canada)

The current use of Teams of Specialists (ToS), led by a country nominated specialists, appears to have worked well in the past. However, while people volunteer to either head or participate in a team, one must remember that many countries face tight budgetary restraints and individuals are charged with ever increasing workloads. The use of ToS should continue, but their roles and mandate should be more narrowly focussed with only limited deliverables. Renewals should only be considered once a team has completed its deliverable.

Teams should be supported by a professional from the Secretariat who has responsibility for ensuring that the work is completed on time. Given the number of available professionals, consideration should be given to limiting the number of teams in order to allow the professionals to focus both on the ongoing activities of both their core activities and the those of the teams. We might want to consider limiting each professional to no more than two teams.

The use of interns with funding provided by the supporting country has proved particularly effective in certain projects. This method of work should be continued with the recognition that it also takes time to supervise the work of interns.

(Finland)

No major complaints in this respect. The periodicity and timing of regular statutory bodies (TC, EFC, etc.) is suitable. The methods of work are versatile and subject to scrutiny and improvements on a continuing basis. In statistics, Metla especially welcomes the establishment of IWG and JFSQ. Need for closer cooperation with the EU (see comments in point 1).

Metla also welcomes the increased use of teams of specialists. They represent the best expertise in their specific areas. In fact, ToS are necessary as the secretariat resources are insufficient.

(France)**Méthodes de travail**

- elles doivent être adaptées au mandat : diffuser de l'information utile ;
- faire appel aux nouvelles technologies de l'information : forum de discussion, courriel, lettres électroniques, site web à mettre à jour (un exemple parmi d'autres : le papier sur la revue stratégique indique qu'il y a 8 équipes de spécialistes, sans en donner la liste ; lorsque l'on cherche sur <http://www.unece.org/trade/timber/joint-committee/tos.htm> il n'y en a que 3 !) ;
- faire connaître ses travaux : communiquer !
- une analyse comparative des méthodes de travail de l'unité de liaison MCPFE de Vienne ces deux dernières années serait peut-être utile ?

(Germany)

No change.

(Hungary)

Considering the current level of resource constrains worldwide the existing methods seem to be an optimal combination of cost-efficiency and productivity. The system of team of specialists is sufficiently flexible to allow member states to contribute "in kind" to achieving regional goals as their circumstances allow.

(Ireland)

There is no reason to alter the current system.

(New Zealand)

Comments: The convening of special topic workshops seems to me to be a very useful device for building common understandings and enthusiasms amongst countries in the region. I note a recent one on Close to Nature Forestry as an example of this. In my experience the exemplary way in which the ToS for TBFRA operated was a positive example of how people from different countries and forestry backgrounds can work together for the common good. I would strongly support continuing to utilise a ToS mechanism for some of the work areas. Electronic dissemination of information via a well-maintained web-site must be a priority.

(Norway)

We have no comments or proposals for changes at this stage.

(Romania)

The **methods of work** should be maintained with some additional elements:

- hold back to back meetings in order to reduce costs and limit frequency
- intensify electronic dissemination and Intranet, focal points
- intensify involvement of professionals (ECE and FAO) for fund raising.

(Slovakia)

- New key-players could be considered for closer cooperation (UNFF as another UN structure dealing with forestry matters, EFI in its new position as an international organization, MCPFE 5th conference being prepared for the first time in country in transition); sometimes it is not easy for countries to participate in overlapping activities.
- Closer cooperation between international organizations should follow the system of work of Inter-secretariat Working Group on Forest sector Statistics as an excellent example of productive cooperation between different international agencies.
- More activity in the promotion of its subsidiary bodies at the government and intergovernmental level, political processes and programmes.
- Assistance to national representatives to improve recognition and support to the national representatives in individual subsidiary bodies. It could be useful to communicate all matters related with the UN-ECE TC and FAO EFC also with officially appointed contact persons at the level of the ministries, forest divisions or central forest authorities.
- Improvement of the role of UNECE TC and FAO EFC as an interface, information and consultation platform between intergovernmental political processes, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and programmes.
- Maybe it would be useful to consider about forming of ToS for 4th and 5th work areas.

(Sweden)

It seems to be no major need for changes of the methods of work. However, the use of the new technologies can be developed, i.e. Webb based questionnaires.

(UK)

- i. Work methods agreed at the first Strategic Review remain satisfactory. These should of course be regularly reviewed, within the realms of routine management functions for continued and improved efficiency.

(USA)

The IWP should continue to utilize member country expertise in developing its outputs, but placing more emphasis on greater coordination and total involvement, necessitating a degree of capacity building in some instances. Teams of Specialists should endeavor to produce timely and informative reports, with direction from the leader and the TC/EFC as appropriate. Consideration should be given to the varying technical capabilities of members and efforts taken to ensure that each is capable at the most advanced level.

(IGO INBAR)

In particular joint projects and activities with the other international organizations and partners including EFI, INBAR, IUFRO, ITTO, etc.

(R. Vlosky - Leader of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing)

1. Surveys to collect current primary information
2. Intensive reviews of the secondary literature in each country to support areas of work
3. Collaboration and "business strategic alliances" with outside entities that are involved in similar or complementary areas of work.
4. Cross-team involvement.
5. A sub-session each year on research priorities, activities and planning
6. Develop a Research planning Team that can coordinate research activities across all ToS and for the TC in general. Right now, "research" is all over the map.

(JC – Hoefle and Salvignol)

Seminars, workshops, teams of specialists, cooperation with other bodies, publications, networks and use of the internet cover a wide variety of working methods. They are:

- adequate to fulfil the mandate of the Joint Committee,
- continuously checked and improved leading to innovative solutions.

Activities are addressed to various audiences in the forestry sector, according to and varying with the theme. The JC brings people together who normally do not meet.

Teams of specialists (TOS) are an effective and efficient tool to clarify specific problems. Care, however, has to be taken in setting up TOS:

- The topic has to be within the reach of a TOS (otherwise, other methods of work such as a "Concerted Action" might be more appropriate).
- A team of specialist needs an active leader and interested members (who can spend the time and financial resources required).
- It has been demonstrated that TOS work more effectively if a "rapporteur" can be provided with the responsibility to digest the information and to write the (draft for the) final report. This, of course, requires adequate financial means.

JC work relies largely on commitment of member countries. Without their support it would not be possible to implement the programme. Consequently, problems (such as cancellation or postponement of planned events, delay of proceedings or of teams of specialists, small number of participants in seminars and workshops, lack of funding for events and TOS) are due to a lack of commitment and active contribution or participation of member countries.

To get a commitment of member countries, we have to provide a better information to resources people in each country. The steering committee could assign this task to each JC members (to be defined)

4-bis : Communication (separated headline. Communication is a tool)

- Website (new presentation and monthly updated)
- JC newsletter
- JC newsletter in each country with the help of JC members

5. What resources¹ should it aim to mobilise, and how?

(Canada)

In addition to the current professional staff funded by both the ECE and FAO budgeting processes, additional financial and physical resources (interns, ToS) can be attracted to work on specific targeted activities.

Beyond the current budget, however, there appears to be limited opportunity to attract additional financial contributions to the ongoing budget.

(Finland)

No reply

(France)

Ressources

- le programme de travail intégré est mis en œuvre par les Etats, avec l'appui du Secrétariat basé à Genève : le rôle des points focaux nationaux est donc primordial;
- une tâche essentielle du Secrétariat est donc d'identifier, motiver, relancer ces points focaux et de travailler en réseau avec eux ;
- outre ce rôle d'animateur de réseau, les autres tâches du Secrétariat sont à formaliser et la question de l'adéquation des effectifs pourra alors être étudiée ; une augmentation des effectifs n'est pas une fin en soi (et chacun connaît le contexte budgétaire actuel) ;
- là encore, une comparaison avec l'unité de liaison de Vienne pourrait être utile : comment ses effectifs ont-ils évolué, en nombre et profils, avant MCPFE4 ?

(Germany)

Continue as before.

(Hungary)

Although difficult to describe how, but member states may wish to consider urging the respective international organizations to increase the professional staff by at least 1 post (i.e. one officer for each of the major work areas). The Committee and the Commission representatives can deliver this message to their governments also asking them to consider seconding experts for limited period of time, as an alternative. On the occasion of this

¹ The integrated programme is implemented by countries, with the support of the UNECE/FAO staff in Geneva, with partners. See annex 1 for more details

strategic review appreciation should be expressed towards those countries who have already contributed to the implementation of the programme of work in any ways.

(Ireland)

As currently.

(New Zealand)

Comments: Inevitably most of the resources will be within the countries themselves. The key for the ECE Timber Committee is to serve as a catalyst so that countries involve themselves actively in the information process. This means arranging the work programmes so that host countries will contribute expertise and facilities. I note, for example, that countries themselves benefit from hosting or providing resources.

(Norway)

(no reply)

(Romania)

Contributions to the integrated programme implementation are made by member countries (activities performed, funds donated, hosting meetings and loaning staff), partners (FAO HQ, ILO, MCPFE), under coordination and support of UNECE/FAO staff in Geneva. **Additional resources** from traditional (trade and environment, ILO) and new partners (energy community?), other intergovernmental organisations (EU?) and NGOs active in the region, could be mobilised for implementing activities of mutual interest (TBFRA, EFSSOS...) and also for cross-sectoral activities.

(Slovakia)

- New economic situation in Europe (EU enlargement) could be taken into account with possibility to mobilize missing resources.
- UN/ECE TC and FAO EFC could take up coordination of activities providing interface, information and consultation platform between inter-governmental political processes, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and programmes in the CEE region. This would allow to mobilize combined resources by the governments, organisations, agencies and programmes for concerted activities launched to achieve the goals of related UN and inter-governmental political processes.

(Sweden)

Resources should be mobilised from the same sources as today. A cooperation between UNECE/FAO and EU in contracting EFI for regional analyses of different kind might be a possible way to increase the financial resources.

(UK)

- i. The Timber Committee should continue to rely on contributions and donations in funds or in kind and increase its efforts to secure these including an assessment of any increased need in the future to rely more on work commissioned from consultants and research organisations.

(USA)

The aggressive and committed schedule of the TC/EFC requires that non-staff resources be fully engaged to undertake the activities and projects of the IWP. Continued emphasis on utilizing team members and Teams of Specialists should continue. However, expectations

may need clarification so that activities are completed on times and projects do not languish for lack of effort. The current position of having time sensitive and time restricted Teams of Specialists ensures that the Teams of Specialists are not driving strategies and ensures that less than fully functioning teams are limited.

(IGO - INBAR)

Extra budgetary resources are likely needed to incorporate new pending issues and gain maximum quality of work.

Outsourcing of staff from the other international organizations with common interests. For instance INBAR and FAO were working with the World Customs Organization (WCO) and have introduced a significant number of new custom codes to the Harmonized System. The new codes would greatly improve data collection of certain forest commodities. INBAR is ready to share the successful experience with the Secretariat.

(R. Vlosky - Leader of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing)

One of the major shortcomings of the TC is that there are numerous mandates of the body itself and of the sub Teams without commensurate funding. If new knowledge is to be developed through empirical research and disseminated effectively, there needs to be an internal source of funds and a funding mechanism. This mechanism would prioritise projects, create strict project parameters and deadlines, and clearly state deliverables.

The TC can not rely on ad-hoc small-scale non-coordinated funding for its activities. Volunteerism is a great thing but there needs to be some institutional support.

Perhaps an annual “Research Fee” can be assessed to member countries on a sliding scale depending on economic conditions or category.

In addition, members of the TC and ToS need to be more active in their involvement. Many good minds attend the sessions but it seems that the annual work of the group falls on the shoulders of a small subset. If active participation can be created, better information will be gathered and the work will be more equitably distributed.

(JC – Hoefle and Salvignol)

The experience since the last strategic review has demonstrated that 5 % of total UNECE is not sufficient to carry out the programme of the JC.

This holds even true on the basis that FAO is further committed. In addition, the commitment of ILO needs to be secured.

JC steering committee coordinators competencies and methods will provide good results with an adapted financial support

The JC heavily depends on the financial support of member countries (host seminars, take part in events, provide participants to and support teams of specialists...). Fortunately, such help has been provided by some member countries (e.g. Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland) and research institutes (in providing funds for participation of members in JC events).

6. Is its formal structure (mandates, permanent bodies etc.) adapted to the needs?

(Canada)

Given the nature of the work program and the shared secretariat, the formal structure appears to work well but is subject to unanticipated requirements of either parent body. FAO's reassignment of Dr. Volker Sasse to other duties within the FAO in 2003, is indicative of the fragile nature of the structure. The transfer of one of the key producers has left a large gap which cannot, within the current structure, be filled.

The current structure of the TC and EFC provides the bureaux flexibility in implementing directives of the parent organizations.

(Finland)

No reply.

(France)

Nous n'avons pas d'opinion particulière sur ce point.

(Germany)

The agendas of the two parent bodies should be clearly split according to their mandate to avoid a great deal of duplication. Timber Committee should focus on markets and economic issues.

(Hungary)

No change is needed now.

(Ireland)

YES.

(New Zealand)

Comments: I believe the formal structure is still serving its purpose but may need some updating to reflect changes in other institutions.

(Norway)

(no reply)

(Romania)

6. The formal structure is enough flexible to be adapted to the needs evolution.

The changes in the general forest policy, cross-sectoral policy aspects affecting the forestry sector should be identified rapidly, analysed and incorporated in the programme during the strategic review, e.g.:

-Does wood industry nowadays influence the forest management in a sustainable way?

-Does the big demand for high volume and cheap wood influence the forest management qualitative aspects in our region?

-Should we monitor qualitative aspects of the forests in our region?

(Slovakia)

(no reply)

(Sweden)

The structure should be changed by abolishing the subsidiary body. The Joint FAO/UNECE/ILO Committee on Forest Technology, Management and Training. The reason for this is that its working area is suggested to be removed from the programme of work (item 2 above). Team of Specialists should, as today, be limited in time and established for topical issues in the main work areas.

(UK)

- i. The current structure is satisfactory and work well.

(USA)

The IWP needs to be flexible enough to respond to informational and related needs on a rapid basis. The ability to create and retain Teams of Specialists provides an excellent supportive structure. As ‘voluntary members’ TOS members are challenged with financial, time and other resource allocation issues. A dialogue with current and past team members could help to respond to the question of team viability. We are opposed to the permanent establishment of teams in all but the most critical situations. The flexibility to create teams and to dissolve teams enables the TC/EFC maximize the knowledge resources of members countries.

(IGO - INBAR)

In general current structure is satisfactory.

(R. Vlosky - Leader of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing)

The Team mandates need to be extended or made permanent with annual reviews. The need to request renewing mandates for the very existence of the ToS creates uncertainty of continuity for participants. The annual reviews will dictate the direction and evolution of the ToS.

An organizational chart needs to be developed and distributed to members. It is unclear what the structure is and who the reporting bodies and individuals are. In particular, it my sense that the FAO part of the partnership is deemphasized relative to UNECE.

(JC – Hoefle and Salvignol)

The JC has no problem with the existing formal structures. They work, however, only with sufficient secretariat support; active members of the Steering Committee and adequate support of member countries.

7. How should its success be measured and monitoring and self-evaluation be implemented?**(Canada)**

Measurement of success is always a difficult task and subject to interpretation by those undertaking the assessment. Success can be measured on two levels, at the deliverable stage when projects are created and, secondly, by measuring the satisfaction of the third parties receiving the outputs.

In the first instance, the deliverable can be associated with a delivery date and success can be measured on the basis of “did it meet the delivery schedule”. The second component can be measured by sampling the target audience to ascertain their satisfaction with the content. In the second case, how the question is asked can influence the outcome of the survey and is best undertaken by independent outside consultants.

My experience with asking readers to return “tear out” comment cards has generally been

unsatisfactory. Readers either don't have the interest or the time to return the cards. They will however return a direct questionnaire delivered by e-mail or respond to a telephone enquiry.

(Finland)

No reply.

(France)

(Germany)

There are different ways conceivable: number of webclicks, questionnaires, preparedness of users to pay for publication....

(Hungary)

Each activity can be considered as a project and key elements of project management methods can be introduced in designing and timing these activities. By defining milestones and deliverables performance can be evaluated against them. Such evaluation would be part of the mandate of the teams and the self-evaluation sheets should be provided for the parent bodies for consideration.

The system may also include an escalation scheme which ensures that each problem is addressed on the lowest possible level were the enabling conditions for solving the problem are available.

(Ireland)

Success is defined by the ability to meet the agreed work programme. This work programme will be time based and costed in terms of resources.

(New Zealand)

Comments: Each year the Timber Committee members need to spend a day reviewing how the work programme has progressed since their last meeting and the outputs from it. Some external review (perhaps from another agency) could also be sought at this time. The Secretariat staff should also be encouraged to speak on what worked well and what hasn't progressed as well as intended. This may reveal some of the resource constraints and the needs for re-allocation of functions.

(Norway)

(no reply)

(Romania)

The success of the integrated programme of work could be measured by:

- monitoring the evolution of participation in the activities (quantitative and qualitative aspects),
- monitoring the number of partners involved in activities,
- monitoring the number and self-evaluating the quality of outputs,
- monitoring the demand for outputs (mentions as references, web-site visitors...),

- monitoring the number and self-evaluating the quality of inputs,
- evaluating the success of fund raising for specific activities.

(Slovakia)
(no reply)

(Sweden)
No reply.

(UK)
i. No comment

On Self Evaluation and Monitoring

- i. Self-evaluation and monitoring is perhaps most relevant to the Teams of Specialist who despite agreed mandates and terms of reference and being time bound have difficulty in bringing their work to a timely conclusion.
- ii. Any extension to the work of ToS needs to be carefully scrutinised and a case made to justify their extension. It is not sufficient for the team themselves to assess whether there is more work to be done in their particular area as they are not necessarily in a position to know members priorities. Perhaps a risk assessment during the early stages of establishing a Team of Specialists could highlight any known or expected hurdles or burdens that may prevent a team delivering within the agreed time limits.

(USA)
There are obviously numerous criteria and indicators of success. At a holistic level, success can be measured in terms of the quality of the product and services provided to the customer. It might be best worthy to query end-users to determine what they deem as success. A difficulty of self-determined success is that there is an inherent disconnect with the products of r services being rendered. Accurate, timely forecasts of market demands may be most meaningful to those producing the documents, but if the end-user ultimately needs an entirely different product for making resource (human, financial, and environmental) determinations, then the success might be measured as high but the functional use low. To endeavor down such tracks is questionable at best.

(IGO - INBAR)
Outputs should be quantified wherever it is possible

(R. Vlosky - Leader of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on Forest Products Markets and Marketing)

Deliverables and accountability. Realistic goals and objectives need to be developed with input from the TC members, not by the secretariat alone. These goals require buy-in from all parties that will be required to execute them. There needs to be metrics and milestones for evaluation explicitly written and distributed to TC members. Often, the biggest source of lack of performance is a lack of communication.

Frequent, quarterly, project status updates needs to be made by the individuals that are put in leadership roles for these projects. This process should take place at the ToS and TC level.

(JC – Hoefle and Salvignol)

The JC has critically evaluated the performance in the past and does so continuously by evaluating every event. The evaluation has resulted in a long running process of updating and improving the working methods of the JC.

The success of the Joint Committee can be - and is - (directly and indirectly) measured through:

proposals for new events by member countries (leading to a concise, interesting and up-to date work programme),

number and composition of participants in JC activities,

quality of contribution to events and of outputs of TOS,

demand for publications,

satisfaction of seminar and workshop participants (see evaluation forms)

If countries fund the organisation of events and send delegates, it is because the theme and organisation meet their priorities and interest.

I think it would be useful to evaluate effectiveness and efficiency of each activity for improving further ones (when it is possible)

The evaluation results could be widely communicated to resource people into each country. It is necessary if we want to attract participants.

Summary

The JC provides an interesting and actual programme that covers the priorities of parent bodies and the needs of member countries. It works with innovative, continuously improved methods, effectively and efficiently, and with a good cost-benefit ratio. It suffers, however, from the underestimation of technical and human resources aspects in sustainable forest management.

More secretariat resources are required to carry out the work programme. Member countries should show greater interest in and contribute more to the work of the JC.

Other Comments

(Sweden)

A coverage of climate issues by UNECE TC and FAO EFC should be included in the working program (see under strategic objective). The perspective should be the climate issues connected with forestry, forest industries and forest fuels. They are relevant in all of the four suggested work areas.

