

**Minutes of the 1st Advisory Panel (AP) Meeting of
the National Forest Monitoring and Assessment Programme (NFMA)**

Monday, October 19 2009 (14.45-18.00)

Pehuén Room, La Rural
Buenos Aires, Argentina

AP members in attendance:

Krister Andersson
Carlos Bahamondez
Michel Bassil
Xia Chaozong
Pol Coppin
Magnus Fridh
Valerie Kapos

Sung-Ho Kim
Christoph Kleinn
Jorge Malleux
Celina Montenegro
Daniel Murdiyarso
Joberto Veloso de Freitas
Claude Vidal

Observers:

Roberto Acosta (for Maria Sanz Sanchez)
Camille Bonhomme
Lars Laestadius
Wing Lau
Boris Tkacz (for Greg Reams from USFS)

From NFMA team:

Dan Altrell
Anne Branthomme
Jim Carle
Inge Jonckheere
Jose Antonio Prado
Mohamed Saket
Rebecca Tavani

Chair: Claude Vidal

Co-chair: Joberto Veloso de Freitas

Rapporteurs: Inge Jonckheere & Rebecca Tavani

Agenda:

1. Opening
2. Self introduction by participants
3. Objectives and agenda of meeting
4. Mandate and Operational Mechanism of NFMA AP
5. FAO NFMA programme: Development, Strategy
6. FAO-Finland programme
7. Recommendations from NFMA AP

Note: Presentations and essential material for the AP may be found at:

<http://www.fao.org/forestry/nfma/en/>

1. Jim Carle, Chief of the Forest Resources Division, FAO as Moderator opened the meeting at 14:45.

Jose Antonio Prado, Director of the Forest Management Division, FAO welcomed everyone to the first NFMA Advisory Panel meeting on behalf of Jan Heino, Assistant Director General, Forestry Department. He recognized experts in the field of forest inventories, social sciences and statistics and explained that the underlying purpose of the meeting and formation of the AP is to strengthen the capacity of the NFMA programme.

2. All participants in attendance gave a round of introductions.

3. Mohamed Saket, Forestry Officer, NFMA programme, FAO gave a presentation briefly defining the objectives of the Advisory Panel and the agenda of the meeting – to review and make recommendations on strengthening the existing NFMA programme. The agenda was adopted, noting that as much time as possible be devoted to discussions.

Claude Vidal was nominated to chair the meeting and Joberto de Freitas was nominated as co-chair. Inge Jonckheere and Rebecca Tavani as rapporteurs agreed to prepare the minutes.

4. Anne Branthomme, Forestry Officer, NFMA programme, FAO presented the mandate and operational mechanisms of the NFMA AP, splitting the mandate into strategic, technical and networking related areas that could be further strengthened.

5. Dan Altrell, Forestry Officer, NFMA programme, FAO gave a brief history of the NFMA program, highlighting that its evolution through the years, has been guided by technical meetings and expert consultations He also outlined the NFMA Programme strategy based upon lessons learned from country experiences and experts' recommendations. .

6. Mikko Leppanen, Senior Forestry Officer and Coordinator of the FAO-Finland Forestry Programme at FAO gave a brief presentation on the FIN-FAO program, providing background information, rationale as well as constraints and challenges of the program. He discussed the role that NFMA could play in serving as the platform for a potential monitoring, verification and reporting of REDD provided that better models, indicators (e.g. carbon pools, biodiversity, remote sensing) are developed.

7. Discussion and Recommendations from NFMA AP

A. Mandates of Advisory Panel vs. Expert Consultations and Technical meetings

Christoph Kleinn sought clarification of clear mandates of expert consultations (EC), technical meetings (TM) and AP meetings, to minimize potential overlaps. Jim Carle explained the differences between the three, indicating the formality of expert consultations and how recommendations for the ECs have a much higher standing than those of TMs and that while the ECs may indicate *what* and *why* the NFMA programme should focus on and enhance, the AP is designed to help prioritize the NFMA approach and in guiding on *how* to implement the suggestions from the ECs. The AP will assist in programming the plan of work for the NFMA program. He added that typically advice from ECs can only go so far – and that NFMA program is seeking a more direct way of obtaining feedback on prioritization and progress of reaching stated objectives and in opening itself up for evaluation.

Jorge Malleux noted that while EC should target specific issues, the AP mandate should be to advise and monitor the program as a whole.

Joberto de Freitas raised the issues of linkages between the AP's for NFMA, NFP and FRA Programmes and the need to recognize synergies. Jim Carle advised that the AP meetings for NFMA and FRA were organized at the WFC (and proposed in the future) back to back. Additionally, 5 of the NFMA AP members are common with the FRA AP, to ensure links are maximized.

Claude Vidal also proposed the minutes to be reviewed by both the Chair and the Co-Chair.

Action:

- The operational mechanism and TORs of the NFMA AP specifically note the back to back AP meetings for NFMA and FRA and that the key roles of several members common to both in order to strengthen synergies
- Clarify the complementary mandates between roles of the EC and that of AP within the ToRs
- Indicate in the Operational Mechanism that the minutes should be revised by both the Chair and the Co-Chair.

B. Conflict of interest

Daniel Murdiyarso raised the issue of whether being involved in both the AP and ECs, created an inherent conflict of interests. It was the opinion of the majority of members that given the infrequent meetings associated with ECs and AP meetings (once a year) that continuity of the program via consistent expert members is paramount to potential conflicts of interests. It was pointed out that where conflicts could potentially arise, that members could abstain from decision making on these specific issues.

Pol Coppin added that he would not advise members to have dual roles in the EC and AP.

Magnus Fridh pointed out that it is easier to have ongoing discussions if dual participation in EC and AP was accepted and that it is more important to have the best capacity for the AP group to be effective.

Action:

- Potential conflict of interest to be addressed in the ToRs stating that if someone has a conflict of interest, he/she should withdraw from the discussion.

C. Linkages with research community

Christoph Kleinn remarked that there should be more linkages made with the research community with regard to developing better models and indicators for carbon assessment, particularly given the limitations in the field. He further noted that obtaining accurate carbon measurements would be limited until better models are developed. NFMA program and FIN-FAO Programme should make closer linkages to research because it is a major driver of progress.

Action:

- Better linkages should be sought with research communities, particularly in regards to the development of models and indicators for carbon assessment.

D. Impact/delivery assessment

Christoph Kleinn recommended that the NFMA team prioritize the follow-up to the inventory impact assessment – and that the implementation of the impact assessment would be key to re-assessing the early phase NFMA countries (Philippines, Costa Rica, Cameroon, and Lebanon). Krister Andersson concurred with this remark adding that waiting until the end of a project to complete an impact assessment is far too late. It must be part of the initial phase of a project.

Jorge Malleux also agreed that focusing on data use and application during both the beginning and end of a project is a very key component. Magnus Fridh also agreed, indicating that the analysis draw a connection between the programme and country-specific decision making processes. This will help in prioritizing what NFMA needs to further deliver. Pilot studies were mentioned as a possible avenue to approaching impact analysis to which Jim Carle added that the FAO-FIN program had provisions for piloting and that 70% of FIN-FAO funds may be spent on this aspect.

Mohamed Saket pointed out that perhaps “impact” was too big a term for what was intended considering that in some cases uncovering a tangible impact might be impossible and proposed to rather consider assessing information uses.

Action:

- Implement impact analysis, particularly as a means to assessing readiness and potential adjustments that may be needed to move on to second assessments.
- Suggests as to how and where should be posed to AP.

E. Coordination between programs (both inside and outside of FAO)

Daniel Murdiyarso remarked on the need to be more strategic and coordinate with like-minded initiatives with regards to using REDD as a means for SFM (i.e. World Bank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and IPCC). Clear and consistent messages are needed between similar programs. Joberto de Freitas reaffirmed the need for close linkages between the NFMA AP and those Advisory Boards of FRA and NFP Facility.

Action:

- NFMA program improve coordination and partnerships with other organizations working on the same or similar issue, particularly in regards to REDD+

F. Communication and way of working of the AP

AP members suggested making available documents and presentation to AP in the website.

Magnus Fridh questioned the best way to enhance AP communication and discussions, so the panel can provide constructive guidance. He recommended that discussion groups be implemented on the Internet. The kind of questions to be posted should be agreed upon.

It was proposed to start email discussions within two weeks to further define the way forward and review the minutes.

Action:

- Create a website for AP to post AP meeting presentations and relevant documents.
- Implement AP discussion groups on the Internet and agree on the types of questions that could be posted.
- Start with email discussion to define the way forward and circulate minutes for comments.

8. The chair closed the meeting at 18:00.