

**Strategic Review 2003/2004  
UNECE Timber Committee and FAO European Forestry Commission  
Integrated Programme of Work**

**Introduction**

Thank you for the invitation to participate in the Strategic Review of the UNECE Timber Committee and FAO European Forestry Commission Integrated Programme of Work. The following is a response from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and is a collection of comments and ideas resulting from consultation with government, non-governmental organisations, industry and trade associations, and others.

In order to assist with the analysis, the response follows the suggested sequence of questions as far as possible. The key contact for the response is the UNECE National Focal point, Mr Mike Dudley, Forestry Commission (contact details below) or alternatively contact can be made with Mrs Frances Snaith, Forestry Commission (contact details below).

**Answers to suggested questions**

**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.

**Major Work Areas**

- 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.

### Outputs

- 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.

### Methods of work

- 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.

### Resources

- 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.

### Formal structure

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

### Measure of Success

- i. No comment

## 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.

**Frances Snaith  
Forestry Commission  
January 2004**

## **CONTACT DETAILS**

Mike Dudley  
Head International Policy,  
Forestry Commission,  
231 Corstorphine Road  
Edinburgh, EH12 7AT  
Tel: + 44 131 314 6115  
Fax: + 44 131 316 4344

Frances Snaith  
Forestry Commission,  
231 Corstorphine Road  
Edinburgh, EH12 7AT  
Tel: + 44 131 314 6497  
Fax: + 44 131 316 4344