

**Network of national correspondents to FRA**

- Present some lessons learnt during the process
- Network evaluation
- Future options for your consideration and discussion during the working groups.

FAO/METLA/UNECE

**Network of national correspondents to FRA**

**LESSONS LEARNT**

**1. Official nomination**

- Nominations were requested to COFO heads of delegations (41 official nominations).
- Invitation to training session (101 official nominations).
- Regional workshops (172 official nominations).

**Nominations need drive (learning process, sharing opportunities, exchanging views, etc. ...)**

FAO/METLA/UNECE

**Network of national correspondents to FRA**

**2. Country reports preparation**

- Fluent communication is essential as well as a good trade-off of those involved (country reports are useful at country level).
- Commitment, and clear understanding of the process.
- Time and efforts to prepare national reports should be recognized by national authorities and preparation of reports planned as a regular activity.

**Ownership of one's own country report**

FAO/METLA/UNECE

**Network of national correspondents to FRA**

**Reports revision and validation**

- FRA reporting process is not easy: collecting the information, organizing, systematized (8 steps), methodologies...etc.
- Longer than envisaged: first presentation of country reports was at regional workshops; detailed revisions carried out by FRA secretariat and NC
- Submitted for validation by national authorities before publishing.

**Efforts involved considerable knowledge-sharing and capacity enhancement from all sides.**

FAO/METLA/UNECE

**Network of national correspondents to FRA**

**2. EVALUATION**

- National reporting is better: guarantees better identification, reliable national information, better re-classification thanks to better understanding of national classes and better national estimates.

**Opportunities**

- Linkages to other reporting processes within FAO, such as Yearbook, NFP, NFI and thematic studies.
- Linkages to other institutions: UN conventions, MCPFE, ITTO, CBD, MDG, CBD, CPF members, C&I process.
- Regional forestry initiatives.

FAO/METLA/UNECE

**Network of national correspondents to FRA**

**Problems faced during FRA 2005**

- FRA recommended by COFO to FAO.
- NCs officially nominated were not the ones preparing the reports.
- Re-shuffling of authorities/duties and NCs
- Country reports revisions took longer than expected.
- Discrepancies with existing reports at international level.

FAO/METLA/UNECE

## Network of national correspondents to FRA

**Overall question: How can regional collaboration and sharing of information and experiences be strengthened?**

- **Who are/should be the members of the NC network?** (officially nominated, officers who prepared the report, head of forestry offices, providers of the information, regional forestry commissions...)
- **What are the (potential) main benefits of being member of a network of NCs ?**

FAO/METLA/UNECE

## Network of national correspondents to FRA

- Which **relevant regional or subregional initiatives** and communication channels already exist (or are being planned) which could be used as a vehicle to increase networking?
- What can existing NCs do to improve networking:
  - Within countries – including other reporting processes
  - Among countries

FAO/METLA/UNECE

## Network of national correspondents to FRA

- How can **FAO and other international/regional organisations** help?
- How can other forest-related organisations (CBD, UNCCC, other CPF members etc) benefit from the network of national correspondents?
- How do we ensure that the reporting burden remains manageable?
- What next? Plan of action?

FAO/METLA/UNECE

## Network of national correspondents to FRA

The establishment of the National Correspondents Network was vital to the success of FRA 2005.

THANKS!!!!

FAO/METLA/UNECE