



# Forestry Department

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

PROCEEDINGS OF  
TRAINING OF  
NATIONAL CORRESPONDENTS  
ON  
ASSESSING AND MONITORING  
OF FOREST LAND USE AND  
CHANGES

17<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> November 2003, Rome, FAO



## The Forest Resources Assessment Programme

Forests are crucial for the well-being of humanity. They provide foundations for life on earth through ecological functions, by regulating the climate and water resources and by serving as habitats for plants and animals. Forests also furnish a wide range of essential goods such as wood, food, fodder and medicines, in addition to opportunities for recreation, spiritual renewal and other services.

Today, forests are under pressure from increasing demands of land-based products and services, which frequently leads to the conversion or degradation of forests into unsustainable forms of land use. When forests are lost or severely degraded, their capacity to function as regulators of the environment is also lost, increasing flood and erosion hazards, reducing soil fertility and contributing to the loss of plant and animal life. As a result, the sustainable provision of goods and services from forests is jeopardized.

FAO, at the request of the member nations and the world community, regularly monitors the world's forests through the Forest Resources Assessment Programme. The Global Forest Resources Assessment 2000 (FRA 2000) reviewed the forest situation by the end of the millennium. FRA 2000 included country-level information based on existing forest inventory data, regional investigations of land-cover change processes and a number of global studies focusing on the interaction between people and forests. The FRA 2000 Main report has been published and is available on the World Wide Web ([www.fao.org/forestry/fra](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra)).

The Forest Resources Assessment Programme is organized under the Forest Resources Division (FOR) at FAO headquarters in Rome. Contact person is:

Peter Holmgren [peter.holmgren@fao.org](mailto:peter.holmgren@fao.org)

or use the e-mail address: [fra@fao.org](mailto:fra@fao.org)

### DISCLAIMER

The Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) Working Paper Series is designed to reflect the activities and progress of the FRA Programme of FAO. Working Papers are not authoritative information sources – they *do not* reflect the official position of FAO and should not be used for official purposes. Please refer to the FAO forestry website ([www.fao.org/forestry](http://www.fao.org/forestry)) for access to official information.

Views of participants reported in this proceeding may be considered as their personal views. These may be same or different than official view of their country.

The FRA Working Paper Series provides an important forum for the rapid release of preliminary findings needed for validation and to facilitate the final development of official quality-controlled publications. Should users find any errors in the documents or have comments for improving their quality they should contact [fra@fao.org](mailto:fra@fao.org).

# Table of Contents

<b>ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>WELCOME SPEECH.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 LAST GLOBAL FRA .....	4
1.2 NEXT GLOBAL FRA 2005 .....	4
1.2.1 Objectives .....	4
1.2.2 Mandate .....	5
<b>CHAPTER 2: OBJECTIVE AND ORGANIZATION OF TRAINING .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 OBJECTIVE OF TRAINING OF NATIONAL CORRESPONDENTS .....	6
2.2. ORGANIZATION AND TRAINING PROCESS .....	6
<b>CHAPTER 3: PLENARY SESSIONS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 INAUGURAL PLENARY SESSION .....	8
3.2 SECOND PLENARY SESSION: NATIONAL REPORTING TABLES .....	9
3.2.1 National Expectations – Germany.....	9
3.2.2 National Expectation – Uganda.....	9
3.2.3 Sixteen National Reporting Tables.....	10
3.2.4 National Reporting Tables 1 - 4 .....	10
3.2.5 National Reporting Tables 5-7 .....	11
3.2.6 National Reporting Tables 8- 10 .....	11
3.2.7 National Reporting Tables 11-14 .....	12
3.2.8 National Reporting Tables 15-16 .....	12
3.3 THIRD PLENARY SESSION: TECHNICAL GUIDANCE FOR GROUP WORK 1 .....	13
3.3.1 National Reporting Format and Process .....	13
3.3.2 Organization of Group Work 1 (GW1).....	13
3.3.3 Introduction to Terms of Reference for Group work 1 .....	13
3.4 FOURTH PLENARY SESSION: OUTPUT OF GROUP WORK 1 .....	14
3.5 FIFTH PLENARY SESSION: COMPLEMENTARY ACTIVITIES .....	14
3.5.1 Information Framework .....	14
3.5.2 National Forest Assessment .....	15
3.5.3 National Forest Assessment in Guatemala and links with FRA .....	15
3.5.4 National Forest Programme links with FRA .....	16
3.5.5 Pan European C&I Process links with FRA.....	16
3.5.6 Montreal C&I process Links with FRA.....	16
3.5.7 ITTO supported C&I Processes links with FRA.....	17
3.5.8 INBAR and its Activities and links with FRA.....	18
3.5.9 Forest relating reporting under UNFCCC and links with FRA .....	18
3.5.10 Forest relating reporting under UNFF and links with FRA.....	19
3.6 SIXTH PLENARY SESSION: THEMATIC REPORTING .....	20
3.6.1 Introduction to Thematic Reporting .....	20
3.6.2 Thematic Reporting in Pilot Study - India .....	20
3.6.3 Thematic Reporting in Pilot Study - South Africa .....	21
3.7 SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION: REGIONAL AND NATIONAL WORK PLANS .....	21
3.7.1 Region Office- Africa Region.....	21
3.7.2 Region Office- Asia – Pacific Region .....	22
3.7.3 Region Office - European Region .....	23
3.7.4 Region Office – Latin America and Caribbean Region.....	23
3.7.5 Region Office- Near East Region.....	23
3.7.6 North American Region.....	24
3.9 EIGHTH PLENARY SESSION: OUTPUT OF GROUP WORK 2.....	24
3.10 NINTH PLENARY SESSION: OUTPUT OF GROUP WORK 3 .....	24
3.9 CONCLUDING SESSION .....	24
<b>CHAPTER 4. GROUP WORK 1- SIXTEEN REPORTING TABLES .....</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	26
4.2 OUTPUTS .....	26
4.3 APPROACH TO REPORTING, DOCUMENTATION AND FORMAT .....	27
4.4 REVIEW OF REPORTING TABLES.....	28
4.4.1 Table 1 Extent of Forests and Other Wooded Lands .....	28
4.4.2 Table 2 Ownership of Forests and Other Wooded Lands .....	30
4.4.3 Table 3 Designation of Forests and Other Wooded Lands .....	30

4.4.4 Table 4 Characteristics of Forests and Other Wooded Lands.....	31
4.4.5 Table 5 Growing Stock of Forests.....	32
4.4.6 Table 6 Biomass Stock of Forests.....	33
4.4.7 Table 7 Carbon Stocks in Forests.....	33
4.4.8 Table 8 Disturbances affecting Health and Vitality of Forests and Other Wooded Lands.....	34
4.4.9 Table 9 Forest Tree Species.....	34
4.4.10 Table 10 Forest Composition.....	35
4.4.11 Table 11 Wood Removal.....	35
4.4.12 Table 12 Value of Wood Removal.....	36
4.4.13 Table 13 Non Wood Forest Product Removal.....	36
4.4.14 Table 14 Value of Non Wood Forest Product Removal.....	36
4.4.15 Table 15 Sites for Social Function in Forests and Other Wooded Lands.....	37
4.4.16 Table 16 Employment in Forest and Other Wooded Lands.....	37
4.5 COUNTRY PARTICIPATION IN WORKING GROUPS.....	38
<b>CHAPTER 5: GROUP WORK 2: THEMATIC REPORTING.....</b>	<b>40</b>
5.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	40
5.2 OUTPUTS.....	40
5.2.1a Thematic Area 1a: Extent of Forests.....	41
5.2.1b Thematic Area 1b: Contribution to global Carbon Cycle.....	41
5.2.2 Thematic Area 2: Forest Ecosystem Health and Vitality.....	42
5.2.3 Thematic Area 3: Biological Diversity.....	42
5.2.4 Thematic Area 4: Productive Functions.....	43
5.2.5 Thematic Area 5: Protective Function.....	43
5.2.6a Thematic Area 6 a: Social Function.....	44
5.2.6b Thematic Area 6b: Economic Function.....	44
5.3 WILLINGNESS OF COUNTRIES FOR THEMATIC REPORTING.....	45
5.4 ROLE OF FRA PROCESS IN FACILITATING NATIONAL THEMATIC REPORTING.....	45
5.5 SUGGESTIONS: ENHANCING LINKAGE BETWEEN FRA AND C&I PROCESS.....	46
5.6 COUNTRY PARTICIPATION IN WORKING GROUPS.....	47
<b>CHAPTER 6: GROUP WORK 3: NATIONAL AND REGIONAL WORK PLANS.....</b>	<b>49</b>
6.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	49
6.2 OUTPUTS.....	49
6.3 NATIONAL WORK PLAN.....	49
6.3.1 Main Activities.....	49
6.3.2 Time Plan.....	50
6.4 REGIONAL WORK PLAN.....	51
6.5 ROLE OF REGIONAL OFFICES IN COUNTRY REPORTING TO FRA.....	51
6.6 COUNTRY PARTICIPATION IN WORKING GROUPS.....	52
<b>CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>ANNEXES (ALL ANNEXES IN SECOND VOLUME).....</b>	<b>55</b>
ANNEX 1: LIST OF ALL PARTICIPANTS IN NC TRAINING.....	55
ANNEX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN WORKING GROUPS FOR GROUP WORK 1.....	55
ANNEX 3: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN WORKING GROUPS FOR GROUP WORK 2.....	55
ANNEX 4: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN WORKING GROUPS FOR GROUP WORK 3.....	55
ANNEX 5: TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FROM GROUP WORK 1.....	55
ANNEX 6: TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FROM GROUP WORK 2.....	55
ANNEX 7: TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FROM GROUP WORK 3.....	55
ANNEX 8: PRESENTATIONS IN FIRST PLENARY SESSION.....	55
Annex 8.1: Development of FRA 2005 & Meeting Process: Mr. P. Holmgren.....	55
ANNEX 9: PRESENTATIONS IN SECOND PLENARY SESSION.....	55
Annex 9.1: National Expectations – Uganda: Mr. P. Drichi.....	55
Annex 9.2: National Reporting Tables: Mr. P. Holmgren.....	55
Annex 9.3: National Reporting Tables 1 – 4: Mr. P. Holmgren.....	55
Annex 9.4: National Reporting Tables 5 – 7: Mr. K. Govil.....	55
Annex 9.5: National Reporting Tables 8 – 10: Mr. Ö. Jonsson.....	55
Annex 9.6: National Reporting Tables 11 – 14: Ms. S. Kelatwang.....	55
Annex 9.7: National Reporting Tables 15 – 16: Ms. M. Garzuglia.....	55
ANNEX 10: PRESENTATIONS IN THIRD PLENARY SESSION.....	55
Annex 10.1: National Reporting Format and Process: Mr. P. Holmgren.....	55
Annex 10.2: Introduction to Terms of Reference for Group Work 1.....	55
ANNEX 11: PRESENTATIONS IN FIFTH PLENARY SESSION.....	56
Annex 11.1 Information Framework: Ms. A. Branthomme.....	56
Annex 11.2 Support to National Forest Assessment: Mr. M. Saket.....	56

<i>Annex 11.3 Support NFA in Guatemala and links with FRA: Mr. R. Rodas</i>	56
<i>Annex 11.4 National Forest Programme links with FRA: Mr. E. Mansur</i>	56
<i>Annex 11.5 Pan-Euro. C&amp;I and MCPFE links with FRA: Mr. Michalak</i>	56
<i>Annex 11.6 Montreal C&amp;I Process links with FRA: Mr. Brad Smith</i>	56
<i>Annex 11.7 ITTO led C&amp;I processes links with FAR: Mr. Steve Johnson</i>	56
<i>Annex 11.8 INBAR activities links with FRA: Mr. Maxim Lobovikov</i>	56
<i>Annex 11.9 Forest relating reporting under UNFCCC: Mr. H. Granholm</i>	56
<i>Annex 11.10 Forest relating reporting under UNFF: Ms. S. Braatz</i>	56
ANNEX 12: PRESENTATIONS IN SIXTH PLENARY SESSION	56
<i>Annex 12.1 Introduction to Thematic Reporting: Mr. Kailash Govil</i>	56
<i>Annex 12.2 Thematic Reporting in Pilot Study- India: Mr. J. K. Rawat</i>	56
<i>Annex 12.3 Thematic Reporting in Pilot Study- S. Africa: Ms. S. Kelatwang</i>	56
ANNEX 13: PRESENTATIONS IN SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION	56
<i>Annex 13.1 Regional Office Africa: Mr. P. Lowe</i>	56
<i>Annex 13.2 Regional Office Asia and Pacific: Mr. M. Kashio</i>	56
<i>Annex 13.3 UNECE, Timber Committee: Mr. A. Korotkov</i>	56
<i>Annex 13.4 Regional Office Latin America and Caribbean: Mr. Mengarelli</i>	56
<i>Annex 13.5 Regional Office North East: Mr. H. A. Nur</i>	56
ANNEX 14: GUIDANCE FOR GROUP WORK 2 AND GROUP WORK 3	56
<i>Annex 14.1 Guidance Group Work 2 and Group Work 3: Mr. P. Holmgren</i>	56
ANNEX 15: ANNOTATED PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE MEETING	56

## Abbreviations

BEF	Biomass Expansion Factor
C&I	Criteria and Indicators
COFO	Committee on Forestry
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
COMIFAC	Conférence des Ministres sur la conservation et la gestion durable des Forêts d’Afrique Centrale
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FORIS	Forestry Information System
FORNESSA	Forestry Research Network in Sub-Saharan Africa
FRA	Forest Resources Assessment
GPG	Good Practice Guidance
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organisation
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organisations
LACFC	Latin American and Caribbean Forestry Commission
LUCF	Land Use Change and Forestry
NAFC	North American Forestry Commission
NC	National Correspondent to Forest Resource Assessment, FAO
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NFI	National Forest Inventories
NFA	National Forest Assessments
NWFP	Non-Wood Forest Products
OWL	Other Wooded Land
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme
TOF	Trees Outside Forest
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
VEF	Volume Expansion Factor

## Welcome Speech

**Mr. M. Hosny El-Lakany**  
Assistant Director-General  
Forestry Department

Ladies and gentlemen, good morning

On behalf of the Director-General of FAO, and the Forestry Department I welcome all participants from member countries, the FRA Advisory Group and the FAO regional offices. I would also like to acknowledge with appreciation ITTO as a co-sponsor of this session. I note that this is a most significant FRA meeting, with more than 100 countries represented through their National Correspondents. I am also impressed by the positive response from countries to our request for nominations of National Correspondents to FRA. More than 120 countries have made such nominations over the past year. Special thanks to the members of the FRA Advisory Group who have guided us in the process up to this meeting. I thank you all for your interest and dedication to the FRA work. This is one of the most important programmes we have in our department.

As you know, the purpose of this meeting is to initiate the country reporting process to the FRA 2005 update. It is therefore a technical meeting where the detailed contents, methods and workplans will be discussed. I would like to briefly mention how FRA fits in the larger context of international forestry processes. First, FAO has a basic responsibility to provide global information on food, nutrition, agriculture, fisheries and forestry. FRA has been part of this normative work of FAO since 1947. The approach, methods and participation are continuously evolving. Originally, the global FRA's were mainly concerned with timber supply from the forests, as this was the main issue identified by policy makers. FRA 1980 expanded into environmental issues and was one of earliest reports on tropical deforestation. In FRA 2000, a broad range of subjects were included. For the FRA 2005 update, we are developing the assessment further by linking to the framework of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management, including social, economic AND environmental aspects of forest resources. We thereby respond to current requirements of political processes by providing the information base needed to address a broad range of forestry issues.

This continuous evolution of the FRA work is clearly a strength that we should build further on. We need to address the challenges involved however. On one hand, demands are changing over time, while on the other, we are trying to maintain stable time series of quality information. I know that you will be discussing these issues this week, and I am confident that you will find the best way forward.

It is well known that the demand for forest-related information is ever increasing. International processes seek to include global information and knowledge about forest resources in their work. FRA has a crucial role in providing access to neutral, timely and quality-controlled information to many of these fora.

It is important to note that there is currently a strong request from countries for better coordination of forestry information at the global level, thereby reducing the high reporting burden on countries to different processes and bodies. Streamlining forest-related reporting has been addressed in several ways over the past few years. For example, within the Collaborative Partnership of Forests, FAO and partners (UNFCCC, UNCCD and the UNFF) are actively working to reduce the reporting burden on countries, by seeking synergies between forest-related reporting processes.

Improving the information compatibility between processes is another prerequisite. Stability over time of parameters and definitions are also very important, as is the approach to information management and documentation that must make it possible to retrieve sources, data and methods of past reporting exercises.

FRA obviously has a key role to play in this context. Building on country-provided information and documenting results in a transparent manner will lead to a reduced reporting effort over time. Also, proper documentation is necessary to back up the conclusions of the global assessments. For example, the FRA 2000 conclusion that the rate of deforestation had decreased (slightly) was questioned by several organizations, and the thorough documentation of source data and analyses were very useful in the debate.

Turning to realities in countries, we should not forget that reliable and accurate information on forest resources are often missing in countries. This affects the possibilities to provide reports to international fora. But more importantly, these information gaps make it difficult to properly take forestry issues into account in national policy processes. Besides the global forest assessment, the FRA programme has therefore a key task to build country capacity and support national forest assessments. I understand that these aspects of our FRA efforts will also be brought to your attention during the week.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Your presence here today confirms that the FRA process is very strong, and that we can build on it to improve the knowledge about global forest resources, including the management and uses of these resources.

Finally, I want to re-acknowledge the presence of representatives of the FAO regional offices and UNECE, which are key entities for the implementation of the global FRA. A number of Forestry Department specialists in a range of fields will also contribute to this meeting. This illustrates well that the FRA work connects to many activities within FAO, including national forest programmes, forestry outlook studies, forest management and conservation, and our work related to forest products and economic and forest policy.

I wish you a very fruitful meeting and look forward to the FRA 2005 update. 2005 promises to be an interesting year in international forestry debate. The conclusions from this exercise will be very timely.

Thank you.

# **Chapter 1: Introduction and Background**

At the request of its member countries, FAO has been carrying out global forest resources assessments (FRA) since 1947, in collaboration with countries and other partners, notably the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). The global FRA reports on the worldwide status and trends of forest resources, their management and uses. It is based on nationally validated data from national forest inventories and assessments. The FRA reports also include analytical assessments (trends and valuations) of goods, services and stock of forests.

## **1.1 Last global FRA**

The latest assessment, the Global Forest Resources Assessment 2000 (FRA 2000) constitutes the most comprehensive and accessible global reporting on forest resources to date. The main report, on-line country profiles, global maps and a series of Working Papers are all available on the Web ([www.fao.org/forestry/fra](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra)).

The main report of FRA 2000 concluded that there are still major gaps in information on forests and forestry and that basic parameters such as forest area and forest biomass cannot be accurately and reliably estimated for most countries, despite the considerable attention, that forestry has received internationally over the past decade. Indeed, demand for forest information has never been greater or more complex than now, with international fora requesting countries to report regularly on multiple functions of forests across social, economic and ecological dimensions, and civil society becoming increasingly concerned about the state and trends of forests stocks, goods and services.

## **1.2 Next global FRA 2005**

The next global FRA is scheduled for 2005 and it will utilise the framework of Criteria and Indicator (C&I) processes for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). It plans to contribute to the discussions at the fifth meeting of the United Nations of Forests (UNFF) in 2005 and to help in the evaluation of progress made by countries towards SFM. A more comprehensive global assessment report will be published around 2010.

### **1.2.1 Objectives**

The global FRA contributes to the improvement of concepts, definitions and methods related to forest resources assessments. Efforts are made to harmonize and streamline reporting with other international forest-related processes within the framework of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, as well as with the process of “harmonization of forest-related definitions”. The assessment is expected to help in reduction of the reporting burden on countries by providing globally harmonised information required by regional and international processes and agreements. The main objectives of the global FRA assessment 2005 are:

- to provide consistent, precise, accurate and high-quality information on the status and trends of forest resources worldwide, to facilitate improved policies related to forests and forest management;
- to help countries view their forest sector within regional and global environmental and socio-economic contexts;
- to provide some of the validated and harmonized data required for monitoring and assessment by international processes;
- to provide data that can be used in technical studies and in support of investment decisions and private-sector development;
- to present relevant information on forests to wider communities, including other sectors, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and public in general.

Future global FRAs are expected to maintain and publish validated and harmonized national, regional and global data for key parameters (a core set global variables) as well as for complementary thematic variables required to explain country-specific conditions. Most of the primary data is expected to come from member countries through an established network of officially nominated national correspondents. Some of the data sets may originate from complementary sources, such as independent remote-sensing surveys. The incorporation of national information into the global database will be undertaken collaboratively between countries and FAO, and will be transparent and well documented to ensure credibility and consistency.

### **1.2.2 Mandate**

The global forest resources assessment receives its mandate from COFO and the FAO Council, technical guidance from expert consultations at Kotka, Finland (see e.g. [www.fao.org/forestry/fra-Kotka4](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra-Kotka4)) and detailed specifications and advice from its advisory group ([www.fao.org/forestry/fra-ag](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra-ag)). In line with recommendations from these entities, FRA 2005 the next global assessment will be a broad and holistic assessment of forest resources (stocks, functions and benefits) and its overall conceptual framework will be defined by the common “Criteria” (Thematic Areas) of the nine regional “C&I for SFM” processes.

Last international expert consultation (“Kotka IV”) in July 2002 recommended enhancing the role of countries, institutionalising the system of national correspondents (NC) including improvement of their capacities. It also recommended to synergise the FRA framework with the framework of Criteria & Indicator (C&I) processes that is common to all the nine regional/international C&I processes, This recommendation was echoed back and reinforced at the international conference on “C&I for SFM” in February 2003.

Committee on Forestry (COFO) further endorsed these recommendations from both Kotka IV and C&I 2003, in March 2003, where countries formally asked FAO to develop a broadened update of FRA for 2005 along these lines. This endorsement from COFO 2003 included establishment of an Advisory Group to global FRA process that is continuously elaborating the global contents of FRA between key stakeholders. Its advice has strongly influenced the assessment process as well as the contents of FRA 2005. The FRA 2005 has also benefited from the outcomes of the two meeting on harmonizing forest-related definitions organized by FAO and partners (CIFOR, IPCC, IUFRO, UNEP, and WMO). The implementation of these recommendation by FRA process has led to development of four basic draft documents (Guide Lines for Country Reporting, National Reporting, Terms and Definition, and Specifications of Global Tables) for consideration by countries and experts.

## **Chapter 2: Objective and Organization of Training**

The Committee on Forestry (COFO) 2003 has endorsed the framework for FR A2005 outlined at Kotka IV meeting including reinforcement and formalization of the National Correspondents (NC) network that constitutes the backbone of the global assessment as it directly engages leading professionals that represent their countries in the assessment work. FAO organized this training of NCs in November 2003 to implement this directive from COFO.

### **2.1 Objective of Training of National Correspondents**

Specific objective of training of NC were the following,

- to formally institutionalise the system of national Correspondents,
- to initiate efforts to build their capacities in global forest resource assessment to respond to immediate needs of FRA 2005 and to long term needs of FRA programme,
- to formally launch for development of FRA 2005,
- to develop national and regional work plans for implementation of FRA 2005, and
- to receive feed back from NCs on the basic three documents (Guidelines For Country Reporting, National Reporting Tables for Country Reporting , and Terms and Definitions) for making changes, if considered necessary.

FAO took the following preparatory steps before the meeting to ensure productive participation of NCs.

- a. Seeking official nominations of NCs for global FRA from all countries
- b. Developing background technical material in close collaboration with the FRA Advisory Group and distributing it to participants three months in advance of the meeting.
- c. Developing pilot studies for five countries (Guatemala, India, Italy, South Africa and Sweden) to serve as example of country reporting to FRA 2005.
- d. Developing a FRA 2005 website to publish the three background documents on the web (“Terms and Definitions”, “Guidelines For Country Reporting” and “Specification of National Reporting Tables” to enhance credibility through openness, transparency and neutrality and to make them available to users at large.

### **2.2. Organization and Training Process**

FAO organised this meeting in collaboration with International Tropical Timber Organisation (ITTO) and invited all officially nominated national correspondents to participate in this process. In addition, FAO requested the members of the advisory group to get direct feed back from the national correspondents before finalizing the three basic documents and schedule of reporting. All FAO staff related directly or indirectly with FRA work, either made presentation or worked as chair or co-chair in the sessions so that NCs feel closer to them and interact with them as and when needed.

The training programme consisted of eight technical sessions, three group works, and one opening and one closing session as detailed below. It followed the tentative schedule drawn for the five days of training of NCs (Annex 15).

1. First Plenary session - Introduction - Concepts, Process and Sixteen reporting tables
2. Second Plenary Session - Introduction to National Reporting Tables
3. Third Plenary Session: Technical Guidance for Group work 1
4. Group Work 1 – Review and comments while working with Sixteen Reporting tables
5. Fourth Plenary Session: Presentation of the output from Group Work 1
6. Fifth Plenary Session: Introduction to Complementary Activities
7. Sixth Plenary Session: Introduction to Thematic Reporting and Group Work 2
8. Seventh Plenary Session: Introduction to Group Work 3 – Development of Work plans
9. Group Work 2 – Links with C&I processes
10. Group Work 3 – Development of Regional and National work plan for 2004
11. Eighth Plenary Session: Presentation of Group work 2
12. Ninth Plenary Session: Presentation of Group work 3
13. Tenth Plenary Session : Concluding Session

## Chapter 3: Plenary Sessions

The training consisted of ten plenary sessions that basically laid the conceptual framework, basis and guidelines for developing FRA 2005. In addition, three group works were woven in the training programme to make things clear and to indicate ways to National Correspondents (NCs) for organising country efforts to implement FRA 2005. The outputs of each group work were synthesised into a single report and presented in plenary sessions for comments by NCs. The last plenary session provided an additional opportunity to National correspondents to make final remarks. This chapter provides proceedings of the plenary sessions, the first of which was “inaugural session” and the last was the “concluding session” and rest were the technical training sessions.

### 3.1 Inaugural Plenary Session

Mr. M. Hosny El-Lakany, ADG (Forest), FAO formally opened the training of National Correspondents (NCs) by welcoming the participants, laying the context, setting the framework for the training sessions and formally launching the FRA 2005 preparation activities. (see his speech at page 2 &3). The Divisional Directors then reinforced the training framework with information about forestry activities in their respective divisions and their link to FRA and its broad framework. Mr. Steve Johnson, ITTO briefly informed participants about ITTO and its wide range of activities that are directly related to FRA and Criteria and Indicator processes. Mr. El Hadji Sène, Director of FOR division where FRA programme is placed, briefed the NCs on activities of FOR division and about FRA process and FRA 2005.

Mr. Peter Holmgren, Chief FORM, who directly supervises FRA briefed the participants about historical development of FRA process leading to current design of FRA 2005 (Annex 8). He informed the participants that FAO’s FRA programme has been a leading provider of global forest information for more than 50 years. Its coverage has evolved over time from covering simple information on timber supply in 1947 and deforestation in 1980 to latest assessment at year 2000 (FRA 2000)<sup>1</sup> where a broad and transparent picture of forest resources in all countries was presented. In addition to factual findings and analyses, an important conclusion drawn in last FRA (FRA 2000) was that knowledge and information on forests remain unsatisfactory in most countries. He also told that FRA is a well-established arrangement where member countries actively participate in the assessment, existing knowledge is efficiently used, published results are generally accepted by international community as the global baseline, and where country capacity is built through active participation.

He explained that FRA 2005 is implementing the mandate given to it by COFO 2003 to further broaden its scope to include all benefits and all beneficiaries over time and space to satisfy the emerging demands, to reduce the reporting burden of countries by harmonising needs, formats and reporting, and to enhance country capacities to generate and provide national information. He indicated that FRA will continue to evolve and adhere to the framework of Thematic Areas common to the nine regional Criteria and Indicator (C&I) processes for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). Furthermore, synergies are sought with other forest-related processes that require national information, in particular the conventions on climate change and biological diversity.

---

<sup>1</sup> FAO 2001. Global Forest Resources Assessment 2000 - Main report. Forestry Paper 140 [www.fao.org/forestry/fra2000report](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra2000report)

He indicated a time frame for FRA 2005 activities that starts with formal request to countries for information in January 2004 to deadline of receiving country information by November 2004 and ends with release of FRA 2005 in September 2005.

He informed the participants that the main purpose of this training of NC was three fold - to raise awareness of FRA 2005, to explain, train and discuss data national data preparation for input to global FRA and to develop national and regional work plans for 2004 to country reporting to FRA that includes sixteen tables and optional component of thematic reporting.

Finally, Mr. M. Hosny El-Lakany, ADG closed the inaugural session with words of thanks and hope that this unique initiative will provide very productive inputs to FRA 2005.

### **3.2 Second Plenary Session: National Reporting Tables**

The second plenary session started with two presentations (one from a developed country (Germany) and other from a developing country (Uganda) describing country expectations from this training programme. This was followed by presentations dealing with technical component of NC training programme specifically with introduction of the sixteen national reporting tables in four presentations by FRA secretariat. Each presentations was chaired and co-chaired by different FAO staff, who introduced themselves to the participants and briefed about their work at FAO before the presentation.

#### **3.2.1 National Expectations – Germany**

Mr. Friedrich Schmitz presented expectations of Germany, representing a developed and industrialised European country, from this NC training programme. He thanked and appreciated that FRA secretariat has sent detailed documentation regarding FRA 2005 to NCs well in time and hoped that training will produce useful outputs. He cautioned that harmonization of terms and definitions should not lead to a breakdown of consistency of the time series data with FRA. He felt that change of a single word might lead to change in time series. At the same time, he appreciated the need of a reporting system that is flexible enough to meet the varied need of different countries and institutions. He also informed that initially Germany has interpreted the COFO 2003 mandate to FRA differently than FAO and added that “Information Note 5” sent by FAO has helped to clarify this issue. He was of the view that reporting burden of the countries can be reduced with stable terms and definitions.

#### **3.2.2 National Expectation – Uganda**

Mr. Paul Drichi, NC presented expectation of Uganda, a developing African country, from this NC training programme (Annex 9.1). He thanked and appreciated the development and distribution of technical documents by FRA secretariat, much in advance of the meeting to the NCs. He opined that the classification suggested for FRA 2005 is simple and good for many countries even with some minor rewordings of FRA 2000 definitions. He informed that his country supports the new developments in FRA and the new mandate given by COFO 2003 regarding reducing update cycle of FRA from 10 to 5 years, broadening its coverage and relating it with other international processes. He appreciated Kotka IV for recommending FRA to place emphasis on countries and NCs, to use “Framework” of regional processes on “C&I for SFM” and to develop synergies with reporting for other related international processes. He was of the view that this training programme will help NCs to understand

concepts, design and reporting process of FRA 2005 and will lead to better national reporting to FRA 2005. Further, that this training will provide a good opportunity to FRA secretariat to get direct feedbacks from NCs leading to a very good start for implementation of FRA 2005.

### **3.2.3 Sixteen National Reporting Tables**

Mr. Peter Holmgren, Chief FORM, presented an overview of country reporting on the “sixteen national reporting tables” by informing participants that it builds on FRA 2000 and relates to the six of the seven thematic areas common to the nine regional C&I processes (Annex 9.2). These sixteen tables contain global variables, their respective definitions, and an eight-step method, which transforms national data into harmonised data for global reporting. He briefly explained all these eight steps to NCs.

### **3.2.4 National Reporting Tables 1 - 4**

Mr. Jim Carle and Ms. Mette Loyche Wilkie respectively chaired and co-chaired the session dealing with reporting tables 1 to 4. Mr. Peter Holmgren introduced (Annex 9.3) the first four tables (1 to 4) to NCs covering their rationale, contents, format, time series (1990, 2000 and 2005) and related issues, if any, with examples of filled tables drawn from one of the five pilot studies. He informed them that the Table 1 (Extent of Forest) has three global variables (Forest, Other Wooded Lands, and Other Land with Trees) that need information at three points in time 1990, 2000 and 2005. Further, that there are two issues one relating to rewording of FRA 2000 definitions to make them simple and clear and second to consider inclusion or exclusion of new variable “Other land with trees”.

He briefed participants Table 2 (Ownership) that also has three global variables (Public, Private and Other/Unspecified) but needs information on two points in time 1990 and 2000). He explained the their utility and informed NC about the reporting units of these variables.

He explained Table 3 (Designation) in more detail to the NCs that has five global variables (Production Forest, Protection forests, Conservation forests, Social Service Forests, and Multiple Objective Forests). He informed NCs that the this table has two issues to resolve. First issue relates to definition of protected area and the second issue is the question whether all forests/other wooded land have multiple uses or can we say that one use is more predominant than others.

Finally, he presented Table 4(Characteristics) that also had five variables (Primary. Modified natural, Semi-Natural, Production Plantation, Protective Plantation) and two issues. The first issue was related to inclusion or exclusion of the variable “Modified natural” and the second was related to redefining plantation to include “native species”.

He concluded that the challenge is to achieve globally harmonised tables. He stressed again that some of FRA 2000 terms and definitions have been simple reworded for FRA 2005 to make them clearer and to address some of the difficulties pointed out by countries during implementation of FRA 2000. He also informed participants that pilot studies on national reporting for five countries (Guatemala, Italy, India, South Africa and Sweden) covering different parts of the world, using guidelines, national reporting tables and terms and definitions for FRA 2005, have performed well and indicate practicality of these documents.

### **3.2.5 National Reporting Tables 5-7**

Mr. Dieter Schoene and Mr. Saket Mohamed respectively chaired and co-chaired the session dealing with reporting tables 5 to 7. Mr. Kailash Govil presented (Annex 9.4) Table 5, 6 and 7 to NCs with their rationale, contents, and format stating that these three tables utilise information from national forest inventories and that attempt has been made to define “terms and definitions” as in proposed Good Practice Guidance (GPG) of IPCC.

He told the participants that the Table 5 provides information on Growing stock or volume of trees with two global variables (“Growing stock” and “Commercial Growing stock”) in three points of time 1990, 2000 and 2005. He indicated an issue to be addressed by NCs in their group work that relates to the question what should be the global minimum diameter of trees for reporting to this table. He explained the use of Volume Expansion Factors (VEF) to transform, if necessary, the national data to meet this global minimum limit. He presented a filled table drawn from a pilot study (India) to make things clear to NCs.

He informed NCs that next Table 6 (Forest Biomass) contains information on three global variables (“Above Ground Tree Biomass”, “Below Ground Tree Biomass”, and “Woody Biomass”) at three points in time 1990, 2000 and 2005. He briefed participants on the use of “Biomass Expansion Factor” (BEF) to convert stem biomass into tree biomass (including branches, stumps, and foliage). He presented a filled table drawn from a pilot study (India) to serve as an example and explained its contents.

Finally, he introduced Table 7 (Forest Carbon Stock) to the NCs that contains four global variables (“Carbon in Above Ground Tree Biomass”, “Carbon in Below Ground Tree Biomass”, “Carbon in Dead Wood Biomass”, and “Soil Carbon”). He presented a filled table drawn from a pilot study (India) and explained their contents and derivation to NCs.

### **3.2.6 National Reporting Tables 8- 10**

Mr. Pierre Sigaud and Mr. Mike Jurvelius respectively chaired and co-chaired the session dealing with reporting tables 8 to 10. Mr. Örjan Jonsson described (Annex 9.5) rationale, content and format of Tables 8 to 10 to the participants with detailed presentation on the “eight steps” to transform national data in each of the “sixteen” tables to serve as input for global reporting.

He informed the participants that Table 8 (Disturbances Affecting Health and Vitality of Forest and Other Wooded lands) has information on four global variables (Fire, Insects, Disease and Other disturbances) at two points in time (1990 and 2000). He presented a filled Table 8 from a pilot study (Sweden) to demonstrate the process of developing its content.

He , then, described Table 9 (Forest Tree Species) to the NCs that contains information on two global variables (“Forest Tree (Inventoried) Species” and “Endangered Tree (Inventoried) Species”) at two points in time 1990 and 2000. He presented a filled table from a pilot study (Sweden) to NCs to serve as an example.

Finally, he presented Table 10 (Forest Composition) that contains information on single global variable “forest composition” (percentage of ten most frequent (by volume) inventoried tree species) at two points in time (1990 and 2000).

### **3.2.7 National Reporting Tables 11-14**

Mr. Adrian Whiteman chaired this part of the session dealing with reporting tables 11 to 14. Ms. Sebueng Kelatwang introduced (Annex 9.6) rationale, content and format of tables 11 to 14 to the participants.

She informed NCs that Table 11 (Volume of Wood Removal) contains data on two global variables (“Industrial Round Wood Removal” and “Wood Fuel Removal”) at three points in time (1990, 2000 and 2005). She presented a filled table drawn from a pilot study (South Africa) to serve as an example.

She then explained Table 12 (Value of Wood Removal) that contains information on two global variables (“Value of Round Wood Removal” and “Value of Wood Fuel Removal”) and needs information at three points in time (1990, 2000 and 2005). She used a filled table drawn from a pilot study (South Africa) to further explain the contents of the table.

She also briefed NCs on Table 13 that has information only on one global variable (Quantity of Non Wood Forest Products) at three points in time (1990, 2000 and 2005). She presented a filled table drawn from a pilot study (South Africa) to serve as an example to develop information for this table.

Finally, she presented Table 14 that also has only one global variable (Value of Non Wood Forest Products) with data at three points in time (1990, 2000 and 2005). She explained development of data for this table with the help of a filled table drawn from a pilot study (South Africa).

### **3.2.8 National Reporting Tables 15-16**

Mr. Dominique Reeb and Ms. Laura Russo chaired and co-chaired the session dealing with reporting tables 15 and 16. Ms. Monica Garzuglia presented (Annex 9.7) the set of last two (15&16) of the sixteen tables to NCs and explained the rationale, contents, format and issues relating to them.

She informed NCs that Table 15 (Sites for Social Functions) contained information on two global variables (Sites for Social Functions and Number of Visitors) at three points in time 1990, 2000 and 2005. She presented a filled table to NCs from a pilot study (Italy) to serve as an example.

She also briefed NCs on Table 16 (Employment) that contains information on three global variables (“Employment from Wood removal”, “Employment from NWFP removal”, “Employment from Other primary Activities”). She presented a filled table to NCs from a pilot study (India) to explain the contents to NCs.

She explained to NCs various problems encountered with these tables during development of five pilot studies (India, Guatemala, Italy, Sweden and South Africa). She informed the participants that the main problem with Table 15 and 16 was that the information was either missing or not satisfactory. Further that as a general statement it can be said that the number of sites for Table 15 was underestimated due to difficulty in monitoring all the sites having social functions, which are not necessarily only designated protected areas. She mentioned

that Table 16 faced similar problem (under estimation and poor information) as exemplified in the five pilot studies.

### **3.3 Third Plenary Session: Technical Guidance for Group work 1**

This session focussed on providing necessary guidance and information to the participants on Group Work 1 (GW1), which was one of the most important part of the training dealing country reporting to the sixteen national reporting tables of global FRA 2005. It consisted of briefing on technical aspects of sixteen reporting tables, organization of working groups for “GW1” and explaining the Terms of Reference for this group work “GW1”.

#### **3.3.1 National Reporting Format and Process**

Mr. Peter Holmgren presented (Annex 10.1) the format (working paper) of country reporting and associated common reporting templates for the sixteen tables. He justified the necessity of the suggested format, proves and associated templates and then explained suggested method, consisting of eight steps, to develop national data as an input to global FRA tables.

He justified the format and process on the basis of enhancement in transparency, traceability and eventual reduction in reporting burden of countries. He explained how the apparent increased reporting for FRA 2005 would ultimately lead to reduced reporting burden for the countries in the long run. He informed the participants that most of the sixteen tables and their global variables build on FRA 2000 tables and variables and are directly related to the six thematic areas that are common among the nine regional C&I processes. Further, that most of the global terms and definitions have been harmonized to enhance their utility with concerned international processes.

He informed the NCs that composition of countries in each of the eight working groups for group work 1 (GW1) has been designed randomly so as to provide them a global (mini-global) feeling. He requested them to appreciate this diversity of conditions in which forests reside and the variation in the quality and availability of information in different countries in their respective working groups for group work 1.

#### **3.3.2 Organization of Group Work 1 (GW1)**

Ms. Hivy OrtizChour informed the participants about the composition (Annex 2) of each working group for group work 1 and requested that each working group should elect its chairperson. She also informed them that the members of FRA secretariat will serve as secretaries to these working groups and their names appear in document relating to composition of groups (Annex 2). She indicated to NCs the location (room number) where each working group will work during the day and suggested that each working group should complete its task by the end of the day including their reports on the group-work so that the same could be presented next day in the morning plenary session.

#### **3.3.3 Introduction to Terms of Reference for Group work 1**

Mr. Alex Korotkov introduced (Annex 10.2) the terms of reference (TOR) for “GW1” (Annex 5) to the participants. He informed that the main purpose and task for each working group is to discuss and provide comments on rationale, scope, contents and definitions for each of the assigned tables as well as to go through each of the eight steps proposed for national reporting

tables. He told them that for this purpose working groups can use either their own (country) data or the data in any of the five pilot reports. Lastly, that working groups have to provide their comments, conclusions, assessments and suggestions in the format suggested in the TOR.

### ***3.4 Fourth Plenary Session: Output of Group Work 1***

Mr. Peter Holmgren distributed to participants a draft synthesis of the outputs of group work 1 from all the working groups. The chairperson of each working group then briefly presented their report and mentioned points, if any, not highlighted in the synthesis. The synthesised report was then opened for discussion and comments by all the participants. The comments given by the chairpersons and participants during this session and those given by them later in hardcopy through their respective chairperson have been incorporated in the output of group work 1. Chapter 4 provides detailed information on group work 1 and its output.

### ***3.5 Fifth Plenary Session: Complementary Activities***

This sessions provides information on activities that compliment the FRA efforts like Information Framework, National Forest Assessment, NFP, MCPFE and Pan European C&I Process, Montreal C&I process, ITTO C&I Process, and INBAR and its activities. This section also includes a presentation by Mr. Heikki Granholm about the “Forest relating reporting under UNFCC given on November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2003.

#### **3.5.1 Information Framework**

Ms. Anne Branthomme briefed (Annex 11.1) the participants on a new initiative of FRA “Information Framework and Remote Sensing Survey” being developed in collaboration with UNEP. She told them it would complement the assessment based on existing country information and may calibrate and validate national data to enhance its utility at global and regional levels. It will independently provide detailed and reliable information on the process of changes in the forest cover (like deforestation, forest fragmentation, degradation), trends (statistical estimates with known precision) and will help in thematic studies like Identification of causal mechanisms of deforestation, and biodiversity and ecosystem assessments. More importantly, it will develop and enhance spatial links between global, regional and national data on forest, land use, and environment in addition to improving standardization, homogenization, compatibility and efficiency of information provided by different applications at different scales and levels.

The “Framework” plans to use a systematic sampling (about 1 % of land surface) on a global aerial grid of intersections at each 1-degree longitudes and latitudes. The size of a selected sample site is about 10 km x 10 km. It is directly linked to National Forest Inventory (NFI) or Assessment (NFA) tracts (1 km x 1 km) at the same intersection. It thus provides for calibration and validation of country data at regional and global levels.

The information framework builds on experience and networks of partners. It is strengthening past institutional arrangements and establishing new ones, like GTOS, GOFD-and GOLD etc., to maintain and sustain the “framework” and to regularly expand its content. It plans for continued improvement in the methods and technologies through active involvement of science and research communities.

The “Framework” plans to use remote sensing data (medium, high and very-high resolution satellite data (like Landsat, Spot, IRS, Ikonos) and aerial photos at regular temporal intervals (5-10 year intervals) and to keep all information at a website with open and immediate access to its content to all its users. Initially, it plans to deal with Landsat data at two points (1990 and 2000) in time at each sample site. FRA plans to undertake pilot studies in Central Africa and possibly in other places to test methodology and implementation of “Framework”. Beginning 2004, the “Framework” plans to coordinate and organize training of national experts to facilitate decentralization of the interpretation work and wishes to include the outputs” in global FRA 2005.

### **3.5.2 National Forest Assessment**

Mr. Mohamed Saket, FAO informed (Annex 11.2) the participants about “Support to National Forest Resources Assessment (NFA)”, a very important component of the FRA programme that deals with the country capacity building in forest assessments. The NFA is a national process to collect, manage, make available and analyse information on forest resources, their management and use covering the entire country, including also analysis, evaluations and scenario development for policy analysis and other uses. The national information on forests is needed to monitor and contain degradation, deforestation, and overexploitation, and to improve productive, protective, environmental and social functions. It is also useful in making plans for food security, which needs integration of information on forest resources with that other land uses in the country. He indicated that many international processes and conventions need this information but currently there are large gaps in such data.

The “Support to NFA” component of FRA facilitates generation new information and consists of interviews, direct observation and detailed national forest inventory. The basic design is systematic field sampling with permanent plots for long term monitoring. It has relatively low and adjustable sampling intensity (50 - 500 sample sites/country) according to country specific needs and has moderate cost covering moderate number of variables spanning all benefits (goods and services). It uses vegetation/land use classification system defined according to country’s specific needs. The plot distribution is systematic and follows intersection of latitude and longitude at each degree, or half-degree or even a quarter degree. At every such intersection location, a cluster of 4 plots of 0.5 ha each is laid on the ground and entered on a map showing land use and tree location. The data is collected and stored in a global database developed by FRA for later processing and analysis of the field data.

At present five projects are in progress in Cameroon, Zambia, Lebanon, Guatemala, and Philippines and agreements are under finalization with Bangladesh, Honduras, Nigeria and Vietnam and a regional initiative in West African sub-region. The ownership of such project is with the country and hence there is a quite high commitment by the countries to implement NFA.

### **3.5.3 National Forest Assessment in Guatemala and links with FRA**

Mr. Rodas presented (Annex 11.3) information to NCs on a ongoing project in Guatemala under “Support to National Forest Assessment” component of FRA. He indicated that Guatemala needed a National Forest Inventory (NFI) to produce the base line of information on its three main types of forests (Coniferous, Broadleaved, and Mixed). The project divided the country into six operating regions, based on administrative boundaries, land use, topography and socioeconomic aspects and used systematic sampling design with sampling

intensity varying in different strata. The total number of sampling clusters were 114 with 456 plots. The data output from the project is designed to satisfy the needs of the six thematic areas of FRA 2005 as well as information on “Land Use” and “Total Tree Volume” for trees greater than 20 cm in diameter at breast height (Dbh).

### **3.5.4 National Forest Programme links with FRA**

Mr. Eduardo Mansur (Annex 11.4) enlightened the participants about the National Forest Programme (nfp) and explained its links with FRA both as provider of information to “nfp” and as recipient of information from NFP. Further, that FRA and “nfp” have same persons as their focal points in 19 countries and “nfp” web site has lot of complementary information for FRA.

He informed that “nfps” are country specific processes for policy formulation and implementation towards sustainable forest management. Further that the “nfp” is a broad concept that embraces any kind of national forest planning process developed under some guiding principles integrating all different roles, products and services provided by forests and trees. The “nfp” supports an inter-sectoral approach addressing impacts of forestry sector on other sectors and vice-versa. It promotes participation of all stakeholders in policy development, planning, implementation and monitoring.

### **3.5.5 Pan European C&I Process links with FRA**

Mr. Roman Michalak informed (Annex 11.5) the participants about Pan-European C&I process including its historical development since 1993 when the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) in its second meeting at Helsinki mandated this activity. MCPFE in its 1998 meeting in Lisbon provided Pan European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management. In its fourth meeting in Vienna in 2003 the MCPFE finally adopted improved Indicators and related assessment guidelines. The MCPFE has also adopted an assessment guideline for Protected and Protective Forest and Other Wooded Land in Europe. He presented indicators against each of the criteria as approved by MCPFE.

He then traced the history or continuous and mutually beneficial relationship of Pan-European “C&I” process with FRA since Kotka III meeting in Finland leading to final outputs in FRA 2000 and TBFRA 2000 publications and current collaboration in ongoing work for FRA 2005 with its presence of its members in Advisory Group to global FRA. He also elaborated the facilitative role of UNECE/FAO in the reporting for MCPFE and FRA. He drew special attention to the latest publication of MCPFE (State of Europe’s Forest 2003) that uses the “C&I” framework and hoped for more intensive links with FRA in future.

### **3.5.6 Montreal C&I process Links with FRA**

Mr. W. Brad Smith (Annex 11.6) presented US experience and informed the participants that “C&I” is not some thing new and that forest mangers always had “C&I” but they were much simpler than what we see today as a follow up of 1992 UNCED meeting at Rio. Further that the approach of “Montreal” process of “C&I” is more holistic and at the same time more complex. It contains 7 criteria of which are roughly common with other “C&I” processes but many of its 67 variables differ with other “C&I” processes.

The international meeting at Guatemala in 2003, where all the nine “C&I” processes were present noted that most of the “Criteria” among them are similar and can be grouped or reformulated into seven criteria. Further, that many indicators are also similar and only some of the definitions are different. These findings lay very good context for future convergence among these processes. He also indicated that criteria (themes) of Montreal process map 1 to 1 criteria (themes) under FRA 2005. About 16 out of 67 indicators match with FRA variables with varying degree (7 good, 5 medium, 2 poor and 2 mixed) of satisfaction.

He informed that thematic report of US for Montreal process has been completed very recently and is available on web ([www.fs.fed.us/research/sustain](http://www.fs.fed.us/research/sustain)). Similarly, Montreal “C&I” process has just completed its report for 12 countries and has released it at the World Forestry Congress 2003. This is available on web ([www.mpci.org/rep-pub/2003/contents\\_ehtml](http://www.mpci.org/rep-pub/2003/contents_ehtml)).

He felt that collection of consistent and reliable data is the first critical step to secure political support for sustainable forest management.

### **3.5.7 ITTO supported C&I Processes links with FRA**

Mr. Steve Johnson informed (Annex 11.7) the participants about history and development of ITTO support to C&I processes starting from 1989 to date. This includes development of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Management of Natural Tropical Forests in 1998, Manual for the Application of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Management of Natural Tropical Forest in 2000 and Reporting Formats during 2001- 2003 supported by regional training workshops.

He informed NCs that field-testing of C&I at forest management unit (FMU) level have been done in Malaysia (1), Indonesia (3), Ecuador (2), and Cameroon (1). He also indicated that about 25 % of 32 participating countries felt difficulty in obtaining data on 40-50% of the indicators and the main problem areas were biodiversity, and soil & water (no data). Some indicators at FMU level (especially endangered species and socio-economic measures) are more applicable at national level. Some indicators were overlapping and some had too general definitions to implement. He told that the “Reporting Format” developed in 2001 is consistent with perceived requirements of UNFF.

The field-testing showed main objective of many countries (forest managers) was certification, therefore, ITTO began developing auditing guidelines for SFM. These guidelines build on ITTO “C&I” and add another layer of “verifiers” to each of the indicator. Several countries are already working on standards of performance and national certification systems and will be best placed to provide information on SFM to ITTO and others.

He pointed out that there is a potential for partner organizations to collaborate on training and assistance in capacity building, mobilizing required resources and that more collaboration between different processes (ITTO/ATO already; 2004 FAO/ITTO Expert Consultation follow-up to CICI 2003) provides a good opportunity for further dialogue. ITTO plans to publish “Status of Tropical Forest Management” in 2004 and many member countries have already submitted first national C&I report for this purpose.

He also mentioned that ITTO needs to work with partners because ITTO understands that many countries will require more assistance than provided to date and that analysis and synthesis of results from country reports will require even more resources in ITTO. He

informed NCs that ITTO considers that it is best to use existing data sets (C&I, TBFRA, FRA) and should resort to direct collection of information from countries only when it is essential. In this context, revision and updating of ITTO “C&I” and Reporting Format (scheduled for 2004/05) provides an excellent opportunity to work towards greater synergies with FRA, including possibility of a joint questionnaire approach.

### **3.5.8 INBAR and its Activities and links with FRA**

Mr. Maxim Lobovikov briefed (Annex 11.8) the participants on International Network on Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR) and its activities and their links to FRA. He told participants that Bamboo and Rattan have created “Golden Revolution” as bamboo grows fast and can be harvested at short rotation specially when its biomass increases annually at the rate of about 30 percent, which is much higher than wood (2 to 3 percent). Further that bamboo has more cellulose than average wood. It is quite tolerant, adaptable, not demanding, environmentally friendly and produces more oxygen than an average tree and sequesters more carbon dioxide, enhances and fertilizes soil, reduces soil compaction and hardening, conserves and regulates water, protects slopes and river banks. He went into quite detail on uses and products of bamboo and rattan. He informed that unlike wood bamboo industrial products are new for the market and are overlooked by the national and international statistics. This is important as any miscalculation leads to misunderstanding and misallocation of the resources.

He told NCs that currently “Bamboo and Rattan” do not appear separately in FRA publications. INBAR can provide information on use and products of “Bamboo and Rattan” and FRA can provide information on extent of “Bamboo and Rattan” resources. He opined that such an exchange will be very useful for both the institutions and may satisfy requirement of the existing international database on resources, production and trade of “Bamboo and Rattan”.

### **3.5.9 Forest relating reporting under UNFCCC and links with FRA**

Mr. Heikki Granholm from Methods, Inventories and Science Programme of UNFCCC, informed (Annex 11.9) NCs about the “Forest relating reporting under UNFCCC”, its characteristics with examples of draft reporting tables.

He told that the characteristics of reporting are based on methodological work by IPCC and SBSTA. The “Forest” is included under LUCF/LULUCF that there is clear purpose and mandate of each reporting whose reporting guidelines are developed and negotiated by parties (countries). He also informed that IPCC has recently developed a “Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF (2003)” but new set of reporting tables is yet to be agreed upon.

He also briefed NCs on estimation of changes in carbon stocks and emissions for land categories and changes in land categories (Forest land, Cropland, Grassland, Settlements, Wetlands, and Other land). He further informed that there is a standardized, electronic, format for reporting estimates of GHG emissions and removals and information on other inventories. The current format is designed to facilitate comparison of inventory data and trends among Annex I countries. The countries are required to provide explanation of qualitative information in National Inventory Reports.

He also briefed NCs on the following seven proposed draft reporting tables for LULUCF activities including their summary table.

- A. Summary table
  - A.1. Afforestation and reforestation; lands not harvested during the first commitment period
  - A.2. Afforestation and reforestation; lands harvested during the first commitment period
  - A.3. Deforestation
  - A.4. Forest management
  - A.5. Cropland management
  - A.6. Grazing land management
  - A.7. Revegetation

### **3.5.10 Forest relating reporting under UNFF and links with FRA**

Ms. Susan Braatz, secretariat of the UN Forum on Forests, informed (Annex 11.10) the participants on the International Forest Policy Dialogue, the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), and their links with global FRA . She informed that UNFF desires to foster a common understanding of sustainable forest management and facilitate implementation of non-legally binding commitments on forests (IPF/IFF proposals for action). Further that the main IPF/IFF proposals for action by countries include the following,

- Improve national forest resource assessments
- Make information related to SFM widely available
- Encouraged countries to prepare national information on the management, conservation, and sustainable development of all types of forests as the basis for any consolidated information at the international level
- International and regional organizations
- Requests of IPF to FAO on FRA 2000
- Improve and streamline international reporting and information systems on forests
- Make adequate resources available for capacity-building for national reporting initiatives

She told the NCs that one of the main activities of the CPF is to “Streamline Forest Related Reporting” to reduce burden of countries and to improve quality and harmonization in reporting. For this purpose, UNFF has set up a task force, which has led to comparative analysis of international reporting requirements, plan to establish a CPF Portal on Forest Reporting, and proposal to develop a unified framework for international reporting on forests.

She informed NCs that UNFF also desires to find means to strengthen country capacity for monitoring, assessment and reporting on forests especially when the main activities of most of the CPF’s member relate to strengthening country capacity in providing forest related information, for example the following.

- FAO – assistance through GFRA, regional forest sector outlook studies, various regional C&I processes, and National Forest Programme Facility
- ITTO - development of national forest statistical information systems, 4 regional and 9 national training courses in the implementation of the ITTO C&I
- UNFCCC - information collection, analysis and dissemination for forest-related carbon inventories

- CIFOR – country-level testing and training related to C&I
- GEF – related to biodiversity, climate and land restoration projects
- World Bank – component of forestry projects

### **3.6 Sixth Plenary Session: Thematic Reporting**

This session focussed on the second element of reporting under FRA 2005 that deals with information on additional complementary national variables on which countries may like to provide information to present a better and realistic picture of their forest resources. This reporting follows the framework of Thematic (Criteria) areas under C&I processes. Earlier presentations by C&I processes provided the necessary context to discuss thematic reporting under FRA 2005. This session presented the information needs and reporting format for FRA 2005 as well as briefed NCs on the two pilot reports (India and South Africa) that contain such thematic reporting.

#### **3.6.1 Introduction to Thematic Reporting**

Mr. Kailash Govil (Annex 12.1) presented to the participants the rationale, thematic areas and format of reporting proposed in FRA 2005. He informed NCs that FRA 2005 proposes to use the six of the seven thematic areas common among all the nine regional C&I processes. Further, that FRA proposes to subdivide the first and the last thematic areas leading to following eight thematic areas under which information is requested from the countries

- 1a. Extent of Forest
- 1b. Contribution to Carbon Cycle
2. Health and Vitality
3. Biodiversity
4. Productive Functions
5. Protective Functions
- 6a. Social Functions
- 6b. Economic Functions

He intimated that the information under each thematic area is required under four headings (Method and Approach, Relevant Variables, Source and Source Data, and Data on Additional Variables). The “Method and Approach” provides background on how the chosen variables were selected and data was collected. For example, South Africa pilot study uses framework of Criteria and Indicator process and India pilot study uses group convergence method for this purpose. The “Relevant variables” provides the list of variable chosen for reporting under a thematic area. The “Source and Source Data” provides documentation and reference for the information collected on each chosen variable. Finally , “Data on Additional Variable” presents the data on each of the chosen variable under a Thematic Area. He used thematic reporting in pilot study for India as an example to briefly explain the concept of thematic reporting to NCs.

#### **3.6.2 Thematic Reporting in Pilot Study - India**

Mr. J. K. Rawat presented (Annex 12.2) in detail the thematic reporting in pilot study for India. He focussed on the “review of sustainability of forest resource” an option under thematic reporting. He also informed NCs that Forest Survey of India (FSI) initiated the field work on inventory of “trees outside forests” (TOF) in 1991-92 and now after ten years of field

work and experience, FSI has developed a methodology to assess the extent of tree wealth outside forest areas (rural and urban) and presented the data on TOF in India.

He explained the thematic reporting and Group Convergence Method (GCM) used in the India pilot study. He informed the participants that a group of 30 experts representing foresters, scientists, academicians, biologists, NGO's, etc. from different institutions was identified and invited to participate in expert group deliberations or consultation using GCM. FSI organized two expert group consultations with a gap of about two weeks. The first expert group consultation identified the variables for each thematic area totalling to 48 variables for all the six (eight with sub division) Thematic Areas. During this consultation, the experts (group) also assigned relative weights to each thematic area and variable using GCM and distributed responsibility among them (25 experts) to compile data on these 48 variables. The second expert (group) consultation focused on assigning value or scores to each variable based on their data and trends using GCM for finalizing scores). The Expert group also assessed the data quality. The product of the relatives scores of Thematic areas and the relative score of variable lead to the score of sustainability of forest resources in India. The exercise indicated that forests in India are sustainable though on the margin.

### **3.6.3 Thematic Reporting in Pilot Study - South Africa**

Ms. Sebueng Kelatwang briefed (Annex 12.3) the participants on South Africa's pilot study and told them that the thematic reporting is based on a consultative process that was undertaken to develop Criteria and Indicators in South Africa. It consisted of eight principles (thematic areas) of which seven are similar to FRA 2005 thematic areas. The eighth principle (thematic area) is unique to South Africa i.e. advancement of previously disadvantage communities. These principles are supported by 72 variables with 139 measures. About 54 out of 72 variables are similar to FRA. Therefore, these variables were packaged under the respective 6 thematic area for thematic reporting to FRA. She explained thematic reporting under each of the six thematic areas to NCs using the information contained in the South Africa pilot study.

## ***3.7 Seventh Plenary Session: Regional and National Work Plans***

This session focused on enhancing role of regional offices in facilitating country reporting to global FRA. This group work (GW3) planned to provide necessary guidance and linkages for development of regional and national work plans for implementing FRA 2005 i.e. developing a timetable to take necessary steps leading to country reporting in November 2003. Initially regional officers introduced themselves and the region to the participants and during group works, they facilitated development of regional and national work plans.

### **3.7.1 Region Office- Africa Region**

Mr. Peter Lowe, Forestry Planning Officer introduced "Regional Africa Office" (RAFO) to the participants (Annex 13.1). He told them that the six most important issues in this region are (a) deforestation and forest degradation, (b) effects of demographics, (c) food security and poverty alleviation, (d) wood fuel, (e) forests and water and (f) biodiversity and wildlife. He also informed that the key responses of FAO to the above six priorities of the region include

(a) development of forestry outlook study for Africa, (b) support form national forest programme facility, (c) support to NEPAD, (d) support to COMIFAC, (e) collaboration with SREOS, and (f) coordination of forest research (FORNESSA).

He informed the participants that most of the land is in dry-zone and LFCC and most of the “forests” are marginal woodlands. The land use is not generally formalized and much of the forests are fragmented and subject to traditional and community ownership. Most of the forests that are outside formal reserves have no declared management objective. Fire is one of the important detrimental factor to the forests. The wood removal is part of formal economy and well reported. The NWFPs are not part of the formal economy and not well reported. These are more related to subsistence use and food security. The employment in forestry in this region plays a very important role in poverty alleviation.

### **3.7.2 Region Office- Asia – Pacific Region**

M. Kashio, Forest Resources Officer, introduced (Annex 13.2) the “Regional Asia Pacific Office” (RAPO) to the participants and told that it has 38 FAO member countries and spans about 3,005 million ha. (accounting for 23% of the world’s land area) with total forest of about 699 million ha. covering 23 % of the total land area (about 18% of total forests in the world).

He informed NCs that the main contributors to degradation and deforestation in the region include (a) advance of agricultural frontiers, (b) pastoral agriculture, (c) cropping, (d) shifting cultivation, (e) urbanization, (f) industrial forestry, (g) forest fires (deliberate and accidental).

He also mentioned that the region is promoting various activities that contribute to sustainable forest management like forest management plans, model forests, criteria and indicators, NFP, reduced impact logging, codes of practice, and promotion of protected area management (Tiger Paper, RAPO Conservation strategy, Asian elephant programmes).

He stressed that promotion of SFM in this region needs enhancement of environmental priorities and review of functions and responsibilities of forestry institutions (major institutional restructurings). He informed NCs that the region is experiencing enhancement of decentralized forest management with emphasis on participatory approach that is linked with rural development and this trend is redefining roles of foresters and demanding new and different skills.

### **3.7.3 Region Office - European Region**

Mr. Alex Korotkov, UNECE Timber Branch, introduced (Annex 13.3) the European Region with special reference to UNECE Timber Branch that coordinated and made substantial contribution for the European region to FRA 2000. The activities of UNECE Timber Branch are designed to fit into both UN and FAO formats. Its work programme is reviewed and formulated every 4 years and is annually monitored by TC and EFC bureaux. It has joint programme with FAO, ILO, MCPFE, EU, EEA, Eurostat and UNEP etc and its stakeholders include WWF, IUCN, World Bank, CSD, Industrial associations, forest owners and researchers. Its work span Europe, North America and CIS countries. This unit will continue to work closely with FRA to facilitate European country reporting to FRA 2005.

UNECE Timber Branch has five main areas of work that include Forest Resource Assessment, Market and Statistics, European Forest Sector Outlook studies, Technology, management and training, Policy and cross-sectoral issues. Recently, it coordinated MCPFE C&I report for 2003. The unit has implemented various special studies that may be useful for FRA 2005 like Biodiversity analysis, Carbon flow analysis, and Endangered species analysis. It has developed Forestry Country Profiles and plans to do similar work in future with focus on CEEC countries. It has contributed substantially to Outlook Studies and to understanding of changes in European Forest Resources.

### **3.7.4 Region Office – Latin America and Caribbean Region**

Mr. Mengarelli introduced (Annex 13.4) the “Latin American and Caribbean” regional Office (RLCO) to the participants and told that “Information” is one of the priority to the region and that the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Latin American and Caribbean Forestry Commission recommended FAO to promote a regional information system on forest resources by identifying information requirements and harmonizing methodologies. He mentioned that recommendations of a technical panel in this respect include,

(a) enhance regional participation in future global Forest Resources Assessments and promotion of participatory integrated methodologies including assessments for shared or trans-boundary ecosystems, such as the Amazon, the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor, the Pacific Biological Corridor, the Caribbean Islands and the Chaqueño Forest Sub region,

(b) exchange of technical and methodological information between countries of the region,

(c) include the reporting requirements of relevant conventions in the global and national assessments, and

(c) develop regional protocols for evaluation and validation of general information.

He also introduced the “Latin American and Caribbean Forestry Commission”(LACFC) to the participants and noted that it should be used as a natural environment for cooperation and channel of communication for FRA purposes and for this purpose FRA should consider strengthening of the Commissions.

### **3.7.5 Region Office- Near East Region**

Mr. Hassan Abdel Nour introduced (Annex 13.5) “Regional Near East Office” (RNEO) to the participants. He informed that all countries in the region are “Low Forest Cover Countries” (LCFCC) countries that are with less than 10% forest / tree cover and only 11 countries have more than one million ha of forests. Majority of the areas are desert, arid or semi-arid and only some of the areas fall in humid zone and high rainfall savannah. Most of the areas have significant “Trees Outside Forests” with “Non-Wood Forest Products”.

He presented photograph of typical forest types in different countries in the region to give NCs a feel of forest resources in the region like humid zone forests in Jordan, Temperate forests in Kazakhstan, Savannah-Mixed forests in Sudan, Sand dune fixation in Iran, Urban forest and trees in Tehran, Shelterbelts-Toshka in Egypt, Pistachia (a NWFP) in Iran, Range lands in Kazakhstan, Invasive species in Yemen, Agro-forestry in Sudan and Agro-forestry in Yemen.

### **3.7.6 North American Region**

There is no regional office in North America and North American Forestry Commission (NAFC) of FAO looks after some of the regional work. NAFC was established in 1958, and provides a policy and technical forum for Canada, Mexico and the United States to discuss and address forest issues on a North American basis. NAFC carries out its mandate by supporting research and natural resource management activities through seven working groups that explore issues of concern to the three countries. These working groups include atmospheric change, fire management, forest products, insects and diseases, silviculture, forest inventory and monitoring forest genetic resources.

### **3.9 Eighth Plenary Session: Output of Group Work 2**

The chairperson of each working group presented the outcome of their working group for “Group Work 2” (C&I Links with FRA) to the participants in the plenary session for discussion and comment by all the NCs. The details are provided in chapter 5 that focuses on the group work 2.

### **3.10 Ninth Plenary Session: Output of Group Work 3**

The chairperson of each working group presented the output of their working group for “Group Work 3” (Developing regional and national work plans for implementing FRA 2005) to the participants in the plenary session. The details are provided in section chapter 6 that focuses on the group work 3.

### **3.9 Concluding Session**

The session was chaired by Mr. El Hadji Sène, Director FOR. Mr. Peter Holmgren presented a brief summary and follow up action to the participants. He briefly informed the participants about progress made during the training week on national reporting tables, thematic reporting and development of work plans to implement FRA 2005.

Mr. Holmgren informed that the FRA secretariat will consider all the suggestions made by the participants when editing final guidelines for country reporting and associated technical

material including improved explanation and examples. He informed that FAO plans to achieve this by the end of the year 2003. He also agreed to the suggestion that copies of GPG (IPCC) when officially available from IPCC will be circulated to all the NCs. He, further, indicated that support to National Forest Assessment may be extended to as many countries as possible and FRA will continue to implement independent remote sensing to validate and to fill gaps in information.

Mr. Holmgren said diverse scenarios have emerged from group work 2 (regarding thematic reporting). For countries, where the C&I processes are well established and active and have recently published reports like Pan-European (MCPFE) and Montreal C&I processes, there FRA may not further enhance utilities and may consider to use an updated version of their country reports. For countries, where the C&I process are relatively dormant and or inactive, there is a possibility to use FRA as a vehicle to support and or revive their C&I processes.

He agreed with participants suggestions that FRA role should be to provide stability, give technical and political support to NC and to interface between country and information demanding international forest related processes.

He informed NCs that following common points that have surfaced during group work 3 on the development of work plans to implement FRA 2005 during Group Work 3.

- Development of a National task force of group of experts
- Organization of Meetings and Workshops at National and Regional level
- Establishment of Electronic networking among NCs and
- Enhanced role of regional offices in facilitating country reporting to FRA 2005

Many participants requested that FAO should provide as early as possible technical and financial support and build national capacities necessary to implement FRA 2005 in time. There was a call for addressing unique conditions and needs of small island countries. UNECE and RAPO raised the question of training the national correspondents of countries not present in this meeting, whose number may be bigger than those present here and suggested early regional workshop to fill this gap.

Mr. El Hadji Sène, Director spoke the concluding words of support and thanks. He expressed his recognition of important and valuable past contributions of NCs to FRA and appreciated their presence in such a large number at this meeting, which further indicated their continued support to FRA and high appreciation of the utility of this meeting. He informed that he has listened to the last part of the deliberations of this session that demanded resources to build country capacities to implement FRA 2005. He acknowledged that it will be a mighty task for FRA to find resources for most of them. He advised them not to wait for these resources and try to use their own resources, how so ever small they may be, to develop a strategy at national level to asses their forest resources. He reiterated that FAO desires to build a long term strong alliance with all countries for forest resource assessments. Mr. Sène thanked all the participants for coming and making very productive contributions. He also thanked all the staff of FAO by saying that “a meeting is a like a tree, what makes it useful but what you do not see are its roots, that is the people behind it who work hard to make it useful”.

## **Chapter 4. Group Work 1- Sixteen Reporting Tables**

The “Group Work 1 (GW1)” dealt with the format, process, contents and terms and definitions relating to “National Reporting Tables” (Working Paper 71b). All the participants (Annex 1) were organized into eight working groups (Annex 2) working with constellation of each working group maximizing as many regions as possible. Such composition of working groups to address “GW1” was designed to provide a cross-regional environment to each participant so that they can appreciate global variation in views, perceptions, capacities, and needs at national level for global FRA.

Each working group had seven “tables” to review of which four tables (T1. “Extent”, T3 “Designation”, T4 “Characteristics” and T5 “Growing Stock”) were common to all the working groups meaning that these four national reporting tables were reviewed by all eight groups and rest of the twelve table were reviewed by two working groups. In addition, each working group was requested to go through all the eight steps (making national data ready for input into global reporting tables) for at least one of the tables (Table T1) and to provide their comments on the definitions, process and format of reporting. Following provides consolidated output from the eight working groups. It incorporates individual comments and suggestions from plenary sessions as well as written comments given to FRA secretariat through respective chairpersons.

### **4.1 Terms of Reference**

This section presents the Terms of Reference for “Group Work 1” in brief while Annex 5 contains the complete TOR. Each working group was required to review entire process (following eight steps) for reporting national data for the global tables including contents and terms and definitions related to them.

- A. Global Classifications & Definitions
- B. National Data Sources
- C. National Classifications & Definitions
- D. National Data
- E. Calibration
- F. Estimation & Forecasting
- G. Reclassification into FRA 2005 Classes
- H. National Information for FRA 2005 Global Tables

### **4.2 Outputs**

The working groups were requested to provide comments on of the assigned tables with regard to their scope and relevance for FRA 2005 as well as international reporting needs. In addition, they were tasked to intimate their assessment of availability of “information” and “time series” for reporting. Finally, they were expected to inform on other issues relevant for them like need for additional resources including capacity building to implement FRA 2005. Following is consolidated version of the outputs from each of the eight working groups. First it provides working group comment in general and then by each of the sixteen tables.

### **4.3 Approach to Reporting, Documentation and Format**

There was general agreement among countries on the approach to reporting, documentation, transformation and classification of national data for sixteen tables. Some countries expressed need for more detailed guidelines and examples to understand and implement the methods correctly of reporting on sixteen tables. The eight steps (A to H) of the reporting process for each reporting table and the format proposed (Working paper 71b) were also considered satisfactory and acceptable. Following is a consolidation of comments on each of the eight steps.

#### **A. Global classifications**

The countries expressed desire to make only essential changes in terms and definitions to maintain consistency in time series of national and global data and that FRA must keep this in mind during final reformulation of Terms and Definitions for FRA 2005.

#### **B. National sources**

The countries indicated that their data sources may be databases as well as official publications but sometimes these may not be official sources, which may create some problem. They also mentioned that the desired information may be scattered between different agencies, and therefore will mean financial and other support to NCs to retrieve and report the information.

#### **C. National classification**

Many countries spoke about the need of “clear” national definitions in their countries that will enable them to provide good report.

#### **D. National data**

Some countries were of the view that report should include error estimates or some statements about it.

#### **E. Calibration**

Most of the countries appreciated the need of calibration to provide consistency in international reporting but at the same time expressed need to have access to their national source data. There were questions about which method to use for this purpose. The consensus was that it is up to the countries to select any scientific method; however, it should be mentioned clearly in their country report.

#### **F. Estimating / Forecasting**

Some countries expressed their desire to report from actual years in national sources instead of forecasting for 2005 because additional non-quantitative data may be needed to make estimates / forecasts and one may need to compare forecasts made in FRA 2000 with new available data from countries, and lastly forecasting is more complicated than estimating. The consensus was that the interpolation, estimations and forecasting are necessary for global reporting. However when estimates and forecasts are done and reported in global data then

this fact must be clearly indicated in the global reports, as well as who has done this, either in a separate column or in footnotes, because at times these figures may be different from national data and reports.

## **G. Reclassification**

The group work revealed following three basic approaches or suggestions to reclassify national data into global classes. The group consensus was to use any of these three approaches in a country that best meets its needs and which can be justified.

- Inventory Database Approach - Build global data directly from databases to reduce the risk for double bias in two steps of conversion.  
(Example: Sweden Pilot Report. Working Paper 77 )
- Percentage Approach - Classify national data based on the degree and level (percentage) it matches with global class.  
(Example: South Africa Pilot Report. Working Paper 75)
- Closest Class Approach- Classify a national class entirely to a single global class or a year, which is roughly similar, or near to it to reduce the risk of misallocations of inventory data and bias in two steps of conversion and to maintain direct links with published reviewed reports.  
(Example: India Pilot Report. Working Paper 78 ).

Many countries requested that FRA should provide more detailed description of the reclassification steps with necessary examples for better understanding and national reporting.

## **H. Input to Global table**

Some countries desired more descriptive instructions with examples to explain the sub-steps involved in moving from step G (reclassification) to H (input to global data).

### ***4.4 Review of Reporting Tables***

Following presents the output of group work 1 by each of the sixteen tables. It reviews rationale, scope, variables and their definitions.

#### **4.4.1 Table 1 Extent of Forests and Other Wooded Lands**

##### **Rationale and scope**

Group work suggested modifying the rationale statement for the table because the contents of the table have the capacity to provide information only on net changes in extent of forests and other wooded lands and not on “deforestation” in isolation. Further that the contents also help to “understand flow of benefits from forests”; therefore, this should be added to the rationale.

The group appreciated the positive move by FRA to provide information on extent of “Trees outside of forests” but indicated some problems in its implementation (see under variables). It also suggested changing the name of the table to reflect all variables contained in the table rather than just “Forest” and “Other Wooded Lands”.

## **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work suggested that it should be made clear that 0.5 ha threshold is applicable to all classes (“Forests”, “Other Wooded land” and “Other land with trees”) as this is not very clear now. It also advised to check logical relationships between definitions and to provide definitions of “Tree” and “Trees Outside of Forests”.

### **Forest**

The group work advised that the reformulation of definition of “Forests” may create misunderstanding and suggested to keep the definition of “Forest” as in FRA 2000. The group work questioned the joint use of two terms “cover” (more correctly: tree presence) and “land use” to define the “forests” and suggested to put biophysical thresholds first in definition, and other land uses as exclusions (as in FRA 2000).

### **Other Wooded Land**

The group work advised to continue use of the definition of “Other Wooded Land” as in FRA 2000. It also mentioned that thresholds other than 5 meters may be desired because of national classification systems used (e.g. Canada, US, Russia, Australia) for defining “Other Wooded Land” (OWL). Another suggestion was to use species lists (tree species vs. shrub species) to easily distinguish between “OWL” and “Forest”.

### **Other land with tree cover**

The group work indicated that majority of groups find this variable useful and relevant and therefore asked FRA to keep this variable. It requested FRA to clarify (a) “tree cover” refers to which tree species (all trees or only forest trees), and that (b) that biophysical attributes of “forest” are applicable to this category of land use also. It suggested that as an alternative species list might be used as to distinguish between “Other Land with Tree Cover (OLwT)” and “Forest”. However, the group work was also concerned about availability of data on this variable in many countries. The group, therefore, suggested to include the possibility to use variable at regional level instead of global and to adapt to national definitions and data. The group work requested FRA to provide clear guidelines supported with sufficient examples to report on this variable including instructions on how to handle n.a. (data not available) cases to make total area fit. One of the suggestion to deal with this was to subordinate this variable to “Other land” or put the area figures under “Other land” if no separate data was available on this variable. The group work also suggested using the word “built-up areas” instead of “urban areas”.

### **Other land**

The group work requested FRA to provide detailed guidelines supported with sufficient examples to report on this variable so that it is clear what is included, what is not included under this variable, and it suggested including other land use classes.

### **Inland water**

The group work requested FRA to provide detailed guidelines with examples and notes for better implementation and to answer queries like how to handle temporary water surfaces.

### **Availability of data**

The group work revealed that there may be difficulty in getting data on OLwT from many countries although some countries may have it. Further, that some of the data may have partial coverage in the country and some regional data may be available through C&I processes. The group work raised concern about availability of information at three points in time for trend estimates in some countries.

### **4.4.2 Table 2 Ownership of Forests and Other Wooded Lands**

#### **Rationale and scope**

The group work revealed acceptance of design of Table 2. However it commented that the information on ownership is useful at national level but is of low utility to global level.”

#### **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work suggested that words “Forests” and “Other Wooded Land” should be added to qualify the ownership. Another suggestion was to consider “religious institutions as community (public ownership).

#### **Availability of data**

The group work revealed that countries have information on this variable but the level of “reliability” of information is generally medium.

### **4.4.3 Table 3 Designation of Forests and Other Wooded Lands**

#### **Rationale and scope**

The group work indicated that rationale is all right but needs some reformulation to make it easy to understand. It advised to rename the table from “Designation” to “Management Objective” as the table mostly deals with managed forests (additional variable may be needed “not managed” or “not designated”).

#### **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work requested FRA to better define the word “dominating” used in the definition of variables and suggested that “main” or “prevailing function” may be a better substitutes for “dominating”.

The group work advised that since the variables for this table are not mutually exclusive, therefore, the sum of their areas should be allowed to exceed 100%. One of the working groups suggested that this table should consist of four sub-tables with two columns (Production and Non Production forests, Protective and Non-Protective forests, Conservation and Non-Conservation forests, Social Services forests and non Social Services forests) for “Forests” and similar four sub-tables for “Other Wooded Lands”. The group work expressed concerns that political considerations may influence the reporting (subjective interpretation) under this table. The group work revealed that it be better if the information is not asked

separately for “Forest” and “OWL” since national data in many countries is not organised in this manner. The group work indicated that possibly there would be low comparability on this data between countries. In this connection, the group work also drew attention of FRA to global classification scheme of IUCN.

### **Production**

The group work advised to include one more variable “Production Other Wooded Lands” so that all categories are represented in this table.

### **Protective**

The group work suggested adding protection of human settlements and infrastructure as additional protective function of forests.

### **Conservation**

The group works appreciated the name to distinguish it from “Protected Areas” and “Protective functions”.

### **Social services**

The group work appreciated the importance of this class and suggested that it is important to include social functions and relate it to table 15. It also revealed need for additional table on values of social services.

### **Multiple use**

The group work requested to provide more detailed description of the variable with examples. It also suggested using wording like “no dominating designation of the above” for defining this category or variable and considering changing its name to “Other use”

## **4.4.4 Table 4 Characteristics of Forests and Other Wooded Lands**

### **Rationale and scope**

The group work indicated that rationale and scope of the table is all right.

### **Variables, terms and definitions**

One of the suggestion from the group work provided to simplify and use regional variables instead (globally only “natural forests” and “forest plantations”).

### **Primary Forests**

The group work suggested that use of term “Primary Natural Forests” instead of “Primary Forests” might better describe the variable.

## **Modified natural**

The group work suggested providing more explanation to provide distinction between “modified natural” and “semi-natural” categories. One of the working groups suggested to keep this “term” or category but with necessary modifications in the definitions and to include all naturally regenerated forests of native species (except primary forests) in this category. Majority of the working groups for this group work suggested merging “modified natural” category with “semi-natural” category, as they did not see clear distinction between the two.

## **Semi-natural**

One of the working groups proposed to include all planted forests, not classified as plantations in this category but indicated some problems of identification in old boreal stands. One suggestion was to include planting/seeding of native species when it is not linear, regularly spaced etc.

## **Productive plantation**

The group work (with individual exceptions) suggested to go back to the FRA 2000 definition that is to include native species (linear, regularly spaced, few species) in the definition of plantations.

## **Protective plantations**

The group work supported to split plantations by productive and protective functions; however, concerns were raised on the benefits and on the distinction with one working group clearly against it.

The group work indicated similar remarks for “Other Wooded lands” including adding “Productive Other Wooded Land” plantation.

## **4.4.5 Table 5 Growing Stock of Forests**

### **Rationale and scope**

The group work suggested including growing stock of “Other Wooded lands” also in this table. The group work indicated that although it is good to have UNFCCC connection good but UNFCCC expectations may be unrealistic. One individual suggestion was to indicate that commercial growing stock takes into account environmental, legal and economic aspects into consideration.

### **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work stressed the need for establishing global threshold for minimum diameter for FRA 2005 as was done for FRA 2000. The work group appreciated the plan to follow IPCC guidelines for biomass for which the estimates of growing stock from this table will be used. The group work provided two suggestions for the minimum diameter (0 cm or 10 cm) and a general agreement to accept any deviation from this in the national data and standards.

### **Availability of data**

The group work indicated that state of availability of data on growing stock in many countries is poor and that most of these countries lack necessary resources to improve data collection and reporting on growing stock.

#### **4.4.6 Table 6 Biomass Stock of Forests**

##### **Rationale and scope**

The group work indicated that the rationale and scope are alright but suggested that the reporting should include also biomass stock for OWL. It also opined that the reporting should be harmonized with the Kyoto and IPCC requirements. The group work advice for continued harmonization with IPCC is desirable and that FRA specifications should follow the new Land use Change and Forestry (LUCF) sector Good Practice Guidance (GPG) of IPCC.

##### **Variables, terms and definitions**

Many countries requested FRA to provide more detailed guidelines with examples to illustrate how to calculate biomass from volume (growing stock) data from forest inventories or studies. The group work advised that definitions of biomass should be tightened to include bark (over bark) and foliage and the reporting should indicate biomass by components (stem, roots, foliage etc.). Further for woody biomass the breakdown should be given by trees, shrub and bushes although this may mean additional volume expansion factors (VEF) and biomass expansion factors (BEF).

##### **Availability of data**

The group work revealed that many countries need assistance in developing conversion factors, detailed guidelines and algorithm (biomass functions BEF). The group work noticed that some countries may miss some data on OWL while in some data is still in process but not yet available. The group work brought out strong concern of the countries that quality and availability of information depends on BEF factors, which are not available at the national level. There was unanimity in the group work over the demand that new set of GPG of IPCC should be circulated to all the National Correspondents to facilitate understanding of the concepts, to know the default BEF values and finally, to make better reporting to FRA 2005.

#### **4.4.7 Table 7 Carbon Stocks in Forests**

##### **Rationale and scope**

The group work indicated that the rationale and scope are alright but suggested that the reporting should also include Carbon stock for OWL. It also opined that the reporting should be harmonized with the Kyoto and IPCC requirements. The group work advised for continued harmonization with IPCC to ensure that FRA specifications follow the Good Practice Guidance (GPG) of IPCC.

## **Variables, terms and definitions**

Some countries requested FRA to provide more detailed guidelines with examples to illustrate how to calculate carbon from biomass figures in Table 6 and how to estimate Soil Carbon. The group work advised that it should be clearly mentioned that FRA definitions are based on IPCC definitions. The group work was concerned on national reporting on “Soil Carbon” because information on “Soil Carbon” in some countries may only be available at sub-national or local level.

## **Availability of data**

The group work revealed that many countries need more detailed guidelines with examples and information on conversion (biomass to carbon and estimate soil carbon) factors to report under this table. The group work noticed that some countries data is still in process but not available while in some may miss some data on OWL. The group work brought out strong concern of the countries that quality and availability of information depends on BEF factors, which are currently not available at the national level. There was a unanimous demand to FRA to circulate new set of GPG of IPCC to all the National Correspondents.

### **4.4.8 Table 8 Disturbances affecting Health and Vitality of Forests and Other Wooded Lands**

#### **Rationale and scope**

The group work was satisfied with the rationale and scope of the table.

#### **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work indicated that this table should consider biotic agents instead of just diseases and insects. It also suggested adding other disturbances like catastrophes, hurricanes, drought and cyclones as well as impacts of acid rain. The group work also suggested that it would be desirable to include degradation of forest if possible particularly for selective extraction. One individual suggestion was to indicate to the countries that they have to report only newly affected area and not the area that stands affected from disturbances in earlier years.

#### **Availability of data**

The group work revealed that information may be available for plantations but it may be difficult to report trends in degradation.

### **4.4.9 Table 9 Forest Tree Species**

#### **Rationale and scope**

The group work felt that rational and scope of the table is fine.

#### **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work was however concerned about information on endangered species especially for countries that are not signatories to IUCN but are signatories to CITES. This was

considered important as both maintain list of threatened species. The group work requested FRA to issue detailed guidelines in this respect. One individual observation that if the inventory specification does not match the species present on the ground then national reporting may provide information by inventory specification rather than what is on the ground.

#### **Availability of data**

The group work identified that generally partial information is available for forest tree species because some of species, that are considered less important, are grouped together in the inventories like “other species” or “miscellaneous species”.

#### **4.4.10 Table 10 Forest Composition**

##### **Rationale and scope**

The group work felt comfortable with the rationale and scope of the table.

##### **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work indicated that it should be clearly mentioned that the data in this table should be compatible or match with Table 5 (Growing Stock). Some of the countries suggested that the unit of reporting should be flexible while some were of the view that it is difficult to quantify. One individual suggestion was to use “area” under species rather than “growing stock” as the latter does not distinguish monoculture from mixed and others.

##### **Availability of data**

The group work indicated that many countries have only partial information and need resources and technical assistance to collect the data.

#### **4.4.11 Table 11 Wood Removal**

##### **Rationale and scope**

The group work indicated that the rationale of the table needs modification as the word “sustainable potential” seems misplaced because there is no information in any of the tables relating to annual increment of growing stock. One individual suggestion was to use “sustainable level of use”.

##### **Variables, terms and definitions**

Some of the working groups suggested that over bark is more desirable for both variables while other groups appreciated the utility of under bark reporting, as it is compatible with international reporting on production and trade. Some working groups considered the option of including “felling”. Some group wanted to clarify that forecasted average figure for 2005 is not only for 2005 but also for the period 2003-2007. One individual request was to clarify whether it includes “forest residues” collected for fuel.

### **Availability of data**

The group work indicated that many countries may have difficulties in providing data on fuelwood removals because of illegal and unrecorded removals and poor information on household use.

#### **4.4.12 Table 12 Value of Wood Removal**

##### **Rationale and scope**

All working groups, except one working group which felt that “economic health” may not be relevant phrase, found the rationale and scope acceptable and satisfactory.

##### **Variables, terms and definitions**

Some working groups expressed the need for more detailed guidelines with examples to explain valuation of non-marketed products and to handle devaluated national currencies.

##### **Availability of data**

No comments

#### **4.4.13 Table 13 Non Wood Forest Product Removal**

##### **Rationale and scope**

The group work found rationale and scope of the table satisfactory. One individual suggestion was to add that it does not include “services”.

##### **Variables, terms and definitions**

No comments.

##### **Availability of data**

The group work felt that national information both for marketed and non-marketed components of most of NWFPs is incomplete and that many countries have information only for few NWFPs.

#### **4.4.14 Table 14 Value of Non Wood Forest Product Removal**

##### **Rationale and scope**

The group work found rationale and scope of the table satisfactory.

## **Variables, terms and definitions**

No comments.

## **Availability of data**

The group work felt that national information both for marketed and non-marketed components of most of the NWFPs is incomplete and that many countries have information on few NWFP. An individual request was to provide more detailed guidelines and explanation to clarify “market value”.

### **4.4.15 Table 15 Sites for Social Function in Forests and Other Wooded Lands**

#### **Rationale and scope**

The group work welcomed coverage of this information and felt that rationale and scope were satisfactory. One working group indicated that “social function” has different meaning in different countries and therefore information across countries may not be comparable. An individual request was to use “bonds” or “links” instead of “bondage” in the text of rationale.

#### **Variables, terms and definitions**

The group work requested FRA to provide more detailed guidelines with examples and further clarify the definition of “sites” and “social functions” with more explanations.

Some individuals felt that number of visitors may not be a good reporting unit due to difficulty in finding data and that it is may be better to indicate area of sites. Some other participants were of the view that whole forests is for the social purposes and that this table therefore, should include all social and economic benefits from forests. Further, that proposed limiting of variables to cover only the recreation and spiritual needs presents a reduced social role of forests for example it fails to highlight contribution of forests to livelihoods of communities. On individual suggestion was that “visits” rather than “visitors” may be better variable.

#### **Availability of data**

One working group felt that FRA may like to provide detailed instructions with examples, probably in consultation with social scientists to collect the data for this table. Another working group also expressed difficulty in identification of a “site” for social function” and suggested that the reporting on this table should be linked with table 3 (Designation). Another suggestion was to change the name of the variable to “sites managed under social responsibility”.

### **4.4.16 Table 16 Employment in Forest and Other Wooded Lands**

#### **Rationale and scope**

The group work appreciated inclusion of this information in FRA 2005 and agreed with rationale and scope of this table.

## Variables, terms and definitions

The group work demanded guidelines that are more detailed with explanations and examples to help NCs in developing inputs for this table. The group work wanted specific instructions to deal employment relating to temporary employees, mixed tasks employments, managers, informal employment and self-employment. Some groups requested that the name of the variables under global definition and input tables should match like in other tables to maintain consistency through out the document.

## Availability of data

The group works indicated that this table may require additional efforts and resources than other national reporting tables because its information will usually come from more than one agency.

## 4.5 Country Participation in Working Groups

National Correspondents present in the training participated in group work 1 through eight working groups as indicated in the following table.

### Working groups for Group-Work 1

Working Group for Group Work 1	Name of Participating Countries	Advisory Group, FAO Regional Office and Others
1	Albania, Australia, Brazil, Cyprus, Dominica, Finland, Germany, Iran, Latvia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Uganda, Zambia, and Trinidad & Tobago	Mr E. Ramesteiner (AG)
2	Austria, Bangladesh, Botswana, India, Kenya, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Myanmar, New Zealand, Seychelles, St. Kitts-Nevis, Sudan, Tajikistan, Turkey, UK, and USA	Mr. M. Kashio (FAO RAP) Mr M. Lobovikov (INBAR)
3	Bhutan, Burundi, Chile, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Hungary, Malawi, Moldova, Namibia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Sierra Leone, South Africa, St. Vincent & The Grenadines, and Swaziland	Mr. H. Abdel-Nour (FAO RNE) Mr Jinhua Zhang (UNEP)
4	Brazil, Cambodia, Gambia, Italy, Malaysia, Mauritius, Montserrat, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Suriname, and Mozambique	
5	Armenia, Guyana, Ireland, Lithuania, Philippines, Poland, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Zimbabwe, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine	Mr Peter Lowe (FAO RAF) Mr. M. Mabrouk (Alexandria University) Roman Michalak (AG)
6	Canada, Croatia, Iceland, Indonesia, Korea, Mexico, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sri-Lanka, and Sweden	Brian Haddon (AG) Alexander Korotkov (AG)

<b>Working Group for Group Work 1</b>	<b>Name of Participating Countries</b>	<b>Advisory Group, FAO Regional Office and Others</b>
7	Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Spain, Uruguay, and Venezuela	Mr. Mario Mengarelli (FAO LAC)
8	Algeria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Tchad, Cameroon, Congo, Djibouti, France, Guinea Bissau, Guinée Repub. Of (Conakry), Mali, Morocco, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, and Tunisia	

## **Chapter 5: Group Work 2: Thematic Reporting**

The group work 2 addressed “Thematic Reporting” component of FRA 2005 and its links with nine regional Criteria and Indicator (C&I) processes. The participants were organized into nine working groups based on membership of their country membership to the nine regional Criteria and Indicator processes. Each working group was requested to review the six thematic areas (Criteria) out of seven thematic areas that are common to all the nine regional C&I processes.

All working groups unanimously (except working groups dealing with Montreal and Pan European processes) expressed their willingness to go ahead with thematic reporting, requested to revive their regional processes and to build their country capacities to provide information relating to thematic reporting. Further, they wanted FRA to take leading role on this issue. The working groups with countries under Montreal and Pan European processes informed that they have recently published their thematic reports and there may not be much new information with them for thematic reporting for FRA 2005.

Following provides the consolidated output from the eight working groups. It incorporates individual comments and suggestions from plenary sessions as well as written comments given to FRA secretariat through their chairpersons.

### **5.1 Terms of Reference**

This section presents them the Terms of Reference for “Group Work 2” in brief while Annex 6 contains the complete TOR. Mr. Peter Holmgren gave guidance on Group Work 2 and its Terms of reference (Annex 6) to the participants (Annex 14.1) that deals with Thematic Reporting with regard its relevance and constraints.

Each working group was expected to examine existing/potential linkages between FRA and the relevant Criteria and Indicator process. The working groups were to examine feasibility for their respective countries to provide information on variables (in addition to global variables) for thematic reporting. Lastly they were tasked to report reasons for which some countries in their group may have opted not to go for thematic reporting.

### **5.2 Outputs**

The working groups were tasked to provide comments on need of more national variables in addition to the global variables (reported in national reporting tables T1 to T16) for better understanding or explanation of the state of forests including their sustainability in a country (including wish list or examples of variables). Further, the working groups were expected to indicate what are the perceptions of countries in their group about role of FRA process to facilitate national thematic reporting and to comment on how the linkages between FRA and Criteria and Indicator processes can be further developed. Following section provides a consolidated version of the outputs from each of the nine working groups.

### 5.2.1a Thematic Area 1a: Extent of Forests

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 1a: Extent of Forests and OWL</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Forest Type
Dry Zone Africa	No additional variables
Dry Forest Asia	Area of recorded forests, Extent of Trees Outside Forests, Area of forest under management plans,
ITTO	Extent of bamboo resources
Lepaterique	Area under management plan
Near East	Area of coniferous, broadleaved and mixed forests, Area of coniferous, broadleaved and mixed OWL, Area of evergreen, deciduous and mixed forests, and Area of plantations
Tarapoto	Area of forest under approved management plans
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

### 5.2.1b Thematic Area 1b: Contribution to global Carbon Cycle

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 1b: Contribution to global Carbon Cycle</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Forest Type
Dry Zone Africa	No additional variables
Dry Forest Asia	No additional variables
ITTO	No additional variables
Lepaterique	No additional variables
Near East	Carbon trade
Tarapoto	No additional variables
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

### 5.2.2 Thematic Area 2: Forest Ecosystem Health and Vitality

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 2: Forest Ecosystem Health and Vitality</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Temporary seasonal flooded forest area
Dry Zone Africa	Biotic interference and moisture stress
Dry Forest Asia	Natural regeneration, Weed infestation, Pollutants, Indicator species, Grazing, Damage from wildlife,
ITTO	No additional variables
Lepaterique	Natural catastrophes like hurricane, cyclones etc.,
Near East	Grazing, Encroachment, Unplanned tourism, Natural disasters, Pollution, Over Exploitation
Tarapoto	No additional variables
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

### 5.2.3 Thematic Area 3: Biological Diversity

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 3: Biological Diversity</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Endemic species, Species by uses, Introduced species, Indigenous species
Dry Zone Africa	Area by Ecosystem
Dry Forest Asia	Area of PA, Endemic species, Threatened species, Invasive species, Forest types, Area of buffer zone
ITTO	No additional variables
Lepaterique	Area of Protected Areas
Near East	Genetic resources, Invasive species, Forest by ecosystems, Role of forest in biodiversity
Tarapoto	List of commercial species
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

#### 5.2.4 Thematic Area 4: Productive Functions

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 4: Productive Functions</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Area of logging, legally exploited annual area
Dry Zone Africa	Percentage of managed (forests and OWL) to total
Dry Forest Asia	Per hectare growing stock, Annual volume increment, Planting stock improvement
ITTO	No additional variables
Lepaterique	Non commercial domestic production
Near East	Quantities and values of subsistence wood, fuelwood, NWFP in informal market, Wood in formal and informal market, Wood consumption
Tarapoto	No additional variables
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

#### 5.2.5 Thematic Area 5: Protective Function

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 5: Protective Function</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	No additional variables
Dry Zone Africa	Area under watershed management, Degraded forests, Mangroves, Mountain forests.
Dry Forest Asia	Percentage of Protective forest
ITTO	Role of PAs and TOF
Lepaterique	No additional variables
Near East	No additional variables
Tarapoto	No additional variables
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

### 5.2.6a Thematic Area 6 a: Social Function

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 6 a: Social Function</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	No additional variables
Dry Zone Africa	Number of licenses / exemptions issued
Dry Forest Asia	Use of traditional knowledge, extent of rights and concessions, Extent of cultural and sacred forests, Area of forest with communities, Area of buffer zone around PA with local communities, Area of lease-hold forestry
ITTO	No additional variables
Lepaterique	Area managed by country and area managed by communities
Near East	Trees and Forest in religious sites
Tarapoto	No additional variables
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

### 5.2.6b Thematic Area 6b: Economic Function

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Additional Variables Thematic Area 6b: Economic Function</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Share of forest sector in GDP
Dry Zone Africa	Ecotourism, Share of forest sector in GDP, Value from Secondary Industry, Forest Sector trade balance, Investment in forests and forest industries including informal sector, Benefits accruing to local communities. Contribution to food security
Dry Forest Asia	Trade of wood, Trade of NWFP, Financial investment in forests
ITTO	No additional variables
Lepaterique	Income to community from forest management
Near East	Eco tourism (quantitative and qualitative analysed information)
Tarapoto	Income at management unit level
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

### **5.3 Willingness of Countries for Thematic Reporting**

Countries belonging to processes other than Montreal and Pan European processes indicated their willingness for thematic reporting however, they needed help to revive their respective C&I processes and to build their national capacities to satisfy the information needs. The countries belonging to Montreal process have more or less identified their information gaps and are adjusting their inventory systems to better fulfil the requirements of the Montreal process. The Montreal process has recently published its thematic report entitled “First Forest Overview Report” in October 2003. The participants were of the view that they will not be able to report more than what they have recently reported to Montreal Process. They also expressed their reservation on use of their information without qualifiers

#### **Willingness of countries under different processes for Thematic Reporting**

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Willingness for Thematic Reporting</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Willing but need help to build capacity
Dry Zone Africa	Willing but need help to build capacity
Dry Forest Asia	Willing but need help to build capacity
ITTO	Willing but need help to build capacity
Lepaterique	Willing but need help to build capacity
Near East	Willing but need help to build capacity
Tarapoto	Willing but need help to build capacity
Montreal	Countries will not be able to report more than what they have recently reported to Montreal Process
Pan European (MCPFE)	In view of their recent MCPFE Thematic Reporting, countries of Pan-European process though it will not provide any additional utility.

The most of the countries belonging to Pan-European process were not willing to provide thematic reports to FRA as they consider it additional reporting burden in light of recent thematic publication by MCPFE covering their region entitled “State of Europe’s Forests 2003”.

### **5.4 Role of FRA Process in Facilitating National Thematic Reporting**

Nine groups deliberated on their perception of role of FRA to facilitate national thematic reporting. They suggested following eight roles of FRA to facilitate national thematic reporting.

- Harmonization of International Reporting
- Development of Unified Reporting system
- Interfaces between Country and International Processes
- Enables synergy between National Correspondents & focal points of C&I

- Promotes coordination between various national institutions
- Provides Stability (terms (variables, definitions and framework) over time
- Gives Political and Technical support to National Correspondents
- Establish and maintains electronic resource “Help Line”

Following is summary of expectations by each C&I processes.

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Role Of FRA Process</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Supporting studies relating to assessment of carbon, Bringing NC in contact with national focal points of international processes like CBD, IPCC and CCD, Technical and financial support to NCs.
Dry Zone Africa	National capacity building, Regional workshops, Support of human, financial & technical resources.
Dry Forest Asia	Revitalization of the C&I process. National and regional workshops, Establishment secretariat for this process, Financial Support, Sharing digital information through Information Framework”, Changing name like “Tropical Asia” C&I process.
ITTO	Guidelines, Training and Capacity Building
Lepaterique	Promotion of exchange of information among countries in the region, Enhanced co-ordination between NC and FRA secretariat, Provide stability to the process, Supporting national forest assessments, Technical and Financial support.
Near East	National capacity building, Harmonising definitions and reporting formats, Interfacing between countries and processes, enhancing coordination between national institutions and agencies.
Tarapoto	Integration of information needs of international processes into FRA, Standardise request for information, building country capacity to generate information, development of unified national database for reporting
Montreal	No additional variables than in their C&I report
Pan European (MCPFE)	No additional variables than in their C&I report

### **5.5 Suggestions: Enhancing Linkage between FRA and C&I process**

The participants made following main suggestions to FRA that mainly related to revitalizing their C&I processes, developing an electronic network among national correspondents, and building country capacities to generate and submit desired information.

<b>Countries of C&amp;I Process</b>	<b>Suggestion</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Improve synergy between NC and focal points of C&I, and Enhance role of regional offices in C&I processes.
Dry Zone Africa	Enhance convergence between information requests of FRA and C&I. Build national capacities to generate quality and timely information.
Dry Forest Asia	Organize national and regional workshops for development and training. Facilitate establishment of a secretariat for this (Dry Forest Asia) C&I process Provide financial support Share digital information through Information Framework Change name of this process to “Tropical Asia” C&I process.
ITTO	Improve coordination between FRA and this C&I processes. FRA to take lead role to implement this request.
Lepaterique	Harmonise information needs and reporting among international processes, convention and agencies, Develop a unified national database Promote in-country development of information for FRA, Develop a network for NCs.
Near East	Enhance FRA involvement in C&I processes Organise regional training workshops to help countries compile and submit quality information in time FRA should cover information needs of C&I processes, Increase interaction between processes, convention and agencies at regional level.
Tarapoto	Bring NCs and national focal points of other international processes nearer to each other for better coordination Provide support to countries for training and development of national reports.
Montreal	Contribute to improved harmonization with and among C&I processes, Organize Regional Workshops for submission of national information to FRA 20005
Pan European (MCPFE)	Organize Regional Workshops for submission of national information to FRA 20005

## **5.6 Country Participation in Working Groups**

The country participation in each of the working group for this group work 2 was quite high and productive. Following table indicates the countries that participated in each working group.

<b>Working group by C&amp;I Processes</b>	<b>Country participation in the working groups</b>
African Timber Organization (OAB)	Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Guinea, Madagascar, Nigeria, Tanzania
Dry Zone Africa	Botswana, Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Gambia, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Swaziland, Uganda, UNEP, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Dry Forest Asia	Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand
ITTO	Brazil, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Togo, Vanuatu
Lepaterique	Belize, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama
Near East	
Tarapoto	Brazil, Colombia, Dominica, Ecuador, Guyana, Jamaica, Peru, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Vincent and The Grenadines, Suriname, Venezuela
Montreal	Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Paraguay, Russian Federation, USA, Uruguay.
Pan European (MCPFE)	Albania, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom

## **Chapter 6: Group Work 3: National and Regional Work Plans**

The group work 3 focussed on development of national o their national work plans providing information to FRA 2005 in synergy with their regional work plan. The participants for “Group Work 3” were organised (Annex 4) according to coverage of countries by the six “FAO Regional Forestry Commissions” (Africa, Asia and Pacific, Europe, Latin America and Caribbean, Near East, and North America). The task was to develop the national and regional work plan for providing information to FRA 2005. The countries belonging to Africa region were further divided in two sub-working groups based on their language (French and English). Similarly, Latin America and Caribbean region was divided in two sub-groups (Latin America” and “Caribbean”) leading to a total of eight working groups. Each working group elected a chairperson and a FRA resource person served as the secretary for the working group. Annex 7 presents the complete TOR for Group Work 3 and the following is brief description of tasks and outputs.

### **6.1 Terms of Reference**

Mr. Peter Holmgren gave guidance on Group Work 3 and its terms of reference (Annex 7) to the participants (Annex 14.1). Based on the earlier deliberation in plenary and group works, each of the six working groups was planned to develop its work plan for generation and submission of information to FRA2005. The working groups were tasked to examine how regional offices can coordinate and facilitate the process of country reporting including organization of regional workshop. Further, they were requested to asses their resource, capacities and mechanisms and identify gaps or weakness so that proposal to build their national capacities for providing data to FRA 2005 can be developed and implemented.

### **6.2 Outputs**

The working groups were expected to list of main activities for their work plans of action (including capacity building) needed for providing country information to FRA 2005 during 2004 at national and regional level. In addition, they were expected to express their expectations from regional offices in coordination and facilitation of submission of country information to FRA 2005 including organization of regional workshops.

### **6.3 National Work Plan**

The national work plan basically had two main components: (a) List of main activities and (b) Time plan. Most of the working groups provided list of main activities but only few working groups presented detail time plan.

#### **6.3.1 Main Activities**

Each working group developed the list of main national activities during 2004 to provide information to FRA 2005.

## Main National Activities

<b>Main National Activities</b>	<b>Common to the region</b> (as indicated in working groups)
Examination of Data Request from FAO	AP, NA, EU, LAC, AF
Organization of a National Meeting of all stakeholders to take stock and share responsibilities.	AP, NA, NE, EU, AF
Participation in first Regional workshop with partial data and partial data processing to fine tune reporting to match FAO needs	AP, NA, EU (Virtual workshop for country present in this meeting and real workshop for absent countries), LAC, AF (English speaking countries request only for National workshops rather than Regional workshops)
Collection of remaining data and or Updating data	AP, NA, NE, EU, LAC, AF
Data Compilation and Analysis (including, review, calibration, estimating, forecasting, and reclassification)	AP, NA, NE, EU, LAC, AF
National review and validation of complied and analyzed information	AP, NA, NE, EU, AF
Participation in second Regional Workshop for final cleaning of data and informal submission of information	AP, NA, LAC, AF (English speaking countries in these FAO regions requested only for National workshops rather than Regional workshops)
Country clearance	AP, NA, AF
Final Formal Submission	AP, NA, NE, EU, LAC, AF

### 6.3.2 Time Plan

There was great variation among working groups in terms of development of a time plan. Some working groups provided detailed time plan, some gave rough time plan and some did not provide any time plan stating that it can be done after consulting their colleagues in the country. Following indicative time plan emerges out after the inputs provided by member countries.

## Indicative time plan

<b>Main National Activities</b>	<b>Indicative Time Band</b>
Examination of Data Request from FAO	January – February 2004
Organization of a National Meeting of all stakeholders to take stock and share responsibilities.	January – March 2004
Participation in first Regional workshop with partial data for clarification and assistance to match FAO needs	March 2004 – June 2004
Collection of remaining data and or Updating data	February 2004 – June 2004
Data Compilation and Analysis (including, review, calibration, estimating, forecasting, and reclassification)	April 2004 – July 2004
National review and validation of complied information	August – September 2004
Participation in second Regional Workshop for final guidance and informal submission of national report	September – October 2004
Country clearance	October - November 2004
Final Formal Submission	October - November 2004

## 6.4 Regional Work Plan

Similar to national work plan the regional work plan had two components i.e. activities and time plan related to them. The perceptions and presentations of working groups regarding regional work plan to implement FRA 2005 had lot of variation (indicative to detailed plan). Following table provides an overview of such regional proposals or work plans.

<b>Main Activities</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Indicative Time Plan</b>
Electronic Networking among NCs and Hot-line Assistance	AP, EU	January – November
Training and Assistance for Development of in C&I	AF, AP, LAC	March 2004
Organization of Regional Training Workshops	AP, EU, LAC, NA (NAFC)	First: March - April Second: Sept. - November
Eco-regional Map	NA (NAFC)	January – September
Facilitation in information processing and submission to FRA	AF, AP, EU, LAC, NA (NAFC), NE	March – November 2004
Validation of data	EU	
Establishment of “Regional Group of Experts”	AP	

(Note 1 AP First workshop is proposed in Bangkok and second in Beijing with help of INBAR  
2. NA regional there is no FAO regional Office, the NAFC provides some support)

## 6.5 Role of Regional Offices in Country Reporting to FRA

All working groups stressed need to enhance the role of regional forest offices in facilitating country reporting to FRA. They suggested to use electronic media to enhance such facilitation specifically they suggested development and maintenance of a regional electronic network of National Correspondents to (a) provide necessary documentation and information, (b) serve as Hot –line or Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) type of help line, and (c) provide them direct electronic links to regional focal points at FRA secretariat in Rome.

## Role of Regional Offices

<b>Role in Providing information to FRA 2005</b>	<b>Region</b>
Development and maintenance of Electronic Networking for FRA 2005	AP, EU, LAC, AF
Organization of Regional Training Workshops	AP, EU, LAC, NA (NAFC)
Facilitation in information processing and submission to FRA	AF, AP, EU, NA (NAFC), NE,
Establishment of “Regional Group of Experts”	AP
Eco-regional Map	NA (NAFC)
Visitor Exchange Program	AF
Information Management System	LAC

## 6.6 Country Participation in Working Groups

The country participation in each of the working group for this GW3 was quite high and productive. Following table indicates the countries that participated in each working group.

<b>Working group</b>	<b>Country participation in the working groups</b>
Africa (French) – AF	Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Guinea Bissau, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Repub. Of Djibouti, Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Togo (16)
Africa (English)- AF	Algeria, Botswana, Gambia, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe (18)
Asia Pacific region – AP	Australia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic Of Korea, Sri-Lanka, Thailand (17). In addition, Mr. M. Kashio from RAP office Bangkok and Mr. M. Lobovikov, INBAR also participated.
Caribbean - CA	Guyana Montserrat, West Indies, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago (7).
Europe – EU	Albania, Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom (26)
Latin America – LA	Argentina, Bolivia, Cuba, Chile, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Republic Dominica, El Salvador, Brazil, Venezuela, Uruguay (15)
Near East - NE	Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Sudan (4)
North America – NA	Canada, Mexico and United States (3). There is no regional office and “NA Forestry Commission” attempts to provide some support to the countries in this respect.

(Note: For this group work, the countries in each working group were grouped according to FAO Region/ Sub Region)

## Chapter 7: Conclusions

FAO has a basic responsibility to provide global information on food, nutrition, agriculture, fisheries and forestry. Forest Resource Assessment (FRA) has been a part of this normative work of FAO since 1947. The FRA is a five decade old well-established arrangement of FAO that enables member countries to actively participate in the assessment and provide relevant national information. It publishes results that are generally accepted as the global baseline and builds capacities of participating countries in forest resource assessment. The latest assessment at year 2000 (FRA 2000)<sup>2</sup> presented a broad and transparent picture of forest resources in all countries. In addition to factual findings and analyses, FRA 2000 drew an important conclusion that knowledge and information on forests remain unsatisfactory in most countries.

Following the mandate from COFO and the recommendation and advice provided by the Expert consultations and the Advisory Group<sup>3,4</sup>, FRA is attempting to fill the information gaps through “Support to National Forest Assessments”. FRA is evolving and developing global FRA 2005 around the framework of “Thematic Areas” common among all the nine regional processes on C&I for SFM for international reporting and is seeking synergies with other forest-related processes that require national information, in particular the Conventions on Climate Change and Biological Diversity. FRA 2005 is broadening its scope to serve as one of unified reporting mechanisms to reduce reporting burden of countries especially when forest-related processes, agreements and conventions are continually increasing their demand of national information for policy development, implementation and monitoring. The breadth of such information requests has grown into a full review of goods and services from forests and trees, including review of environmental sustainability and contribution to cross-sectoral benefits like the alleviation of poverty.

To implement the above, FRA is institutionalising and reinforcing the network of its national correspondents, as they continue to be the backbone of the global FRA programme. In doing so, the FRA recently requested countries to officially nominate their National Correspondents (NCs) to global FRA and received an overwhelming and immediate response from more than 120 countries to its. Further, FRA organised a one week training for National Correspondents during November (17<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup>, 2003) to involve them from the very beginning into its FRA 2005 process and on the way build their capacities. The training aimed to explain documents and reporting formats to NCs and to train them in transforming and harmonising their national data to serve as input to global FRA.

The “NCs Training” was a unique effort in the five decade long history of FRA and more than 100 countries actively participated in it. This has yielded very positive and encouraging results and has also served to launch the FRA 2005 global activities.

Broadly speaking, the participating countries supported the scope, contents and format of FRA 2005 which builds on a core of sixteen global reporting tables and an optional element of thematic reporting. Except for some countries, that are members of Pan-European and Montreal C&I process which have recently published their C&I report, most of the countries were willing to contribute to the thematic reporting under FRA 2005. They expressed their need to build national capacities in order to satisfy enhanced and broadened demand of

---

<sup>2</sup> FAO 2001. Global Forest Resources Assessment 2000 - Main report. Forestry Paper 140 [www.fao.org/forestry/fra2000report](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra2000report)

<sup>3</sup> Kotka IV Expert Consultation 1-5 July 2002, Kotka, Finland [www.fao.org/forestry/Kotka4](http://www.fao.org/forestry/Kotka4)

<sup>4</sup> FRA Advisory Group [www.fao.org/forestry/fra-ag](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra-ag)

national information. They requested for more detailed guidelines with examples to provide right and better quality information. All countries expressed their desire to reduce the burden of reporting and to have an unified, consistent and stable reporting mechanism.

During training session, almost all countries expressed high expectations from FRA programme that includes providing consistency and stability over time in reporting requirements, harmonizing international reporting across processes, lending political and technical support to NCs, and establishing an “Electronic Forum” to serve as “Help Line” and as an “ Information Center”.

Many countries wanted FRA to take lead of international reporting and serve as an interface between country and the International Processes. They also perceived that FRA promotes the coordination between various national institutions, enables synergy between NCs & focal points of C&I, and that it may finally lead to a forest related “Unified International Reporting System”. All countries stressed the need for an enhanced and more active role of FAO’s “Regional Forestry Commissions” and “Regional Offices” in the FRA process particularly in facilitation and coordination among national regional activities, mobilization of resources to implement FRA, the organization of Regional Workshops and the development of “Regional Group of Experts”.

Finally, a very important output of this meeting was development of an integrated work plan of regional and national activities for 2004 that will enable participating countries to provide their national data inputs to global FRA well in time.