

# STRATEGY FOR FAO AND UNECE FORESTRY ACTIVITIES IN EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA <sup>1</sup>

## 1. Introduction

This strategy has been prepared by FAO and UNECE, in consultation with a number of stakeholders in the forest sector in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The purpose of the strategy is to describe the main areas where the FAO Forestry Department and UNECE Timber Section should focus future activities in the near-term in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.<sup>1</sup> The strategy describes the main priorities for future FAO and UNECE activities in the forest sector in this region and presents the methods that will be used to implement these activities.

The strategy covers the period 2007-2013 and will be reviewed annually by the Joint Bureaux of the FAO European Forestry Commission and the UNECE Timber Committee. The UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on “Contribution of Forest Management to Sustainable Development in Eastern Europe and Central Asia” (see Annex 1) advises the bureaux on the current Strategy and supports its implementation with the help of officially nominated national experts.

## 2. Situation analysis

### 2.1. Background

During the 1990s, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe as well as Central Asia started the process of transition from centrally planned to market economies. In many cases, this transition has led to profound social and economic changes. However, progress with this transition has been mixed and conditions now vary enormously between these countries.

In particular, the countries that are closer to Western Europe have generally made more progress towards the development of a market economy. Eight countries in Central respectively Eastern Europe have already progressed so rapidly that they joined the EU in 2004 <sup>2</sup> after implementing numerous policy reforms across all sectors over less than a decade. Other countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia have made much less progress and remain partly in the early stages of the transition process or even at the beginning of the process.

At a broad level, the transition process involves a number of political and macroeconomic reforms (e.g. privatisation, changes in land ownership and property laws, etc.) that have large impact on the progress towards a market economy. Changes in the forest sector are largely derived from these broader reforms.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Eastern Europe and Central Asia are defined here to include: Albania; Armenia; Belarus; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Bulgaria; Croatia; Georgia; Kazakhstan; Kyrgyzstan; Republic of Azerbaijan; Republic of Moldova; Romania; Russian Federation; Serbia, Montenegro; Tajikistan; The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Turkmenistan; Ukraine; and Uzbekistan. Note: all countries are UNECE members and all but Montenegro are FAO members.

<sup>2</sup> The presence of a market economy is a condition of accession to the EU. Therefore by definition, these countries are no longer “countries with economies in transition”. Consequently, they are not a focus of this strategy. However, they are included in some parts of the strategy, as they have valuable lessons to share with other countries in this region.

Furthermore, the forest management policies implemented in support of the transition process have differed between countries. For example, the procedures used to return state assets to their former private owners (restitution) have varied between countries, as have the shares of forests that have been returned to private ownership. However, most of the countries that have made considerable progress with the transition process share some similar features in terms of the measures that they have implemented and the other changes that have occurred as a result of the transition process (see table below).

<b>Common features of the transition process of forest management</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reorganisation of state assets in the forest sector, including: privatization respectively restitution of forest land to private forest owners; sale of forest enterprises to national and international investors; and restructuring of remaining state assets (e.g. decentralisation of forest management, outsourcing of state forest management to commercial entities).</li> <li>• Development of a private forest sector, including: increased private-sector investment; development of private forest management institutions (e.g. forest owners' associations); and development of forest management and marketing skills in the private sector.</li> <li>• Increasing needs in social and environmental services from forest management and appearance of specialized policies and institutions;</li> <li>• Changes in policy and legislation to reflect greater private-sector involvement in the forest sector and the changing role of the state from control of all forestry activities to design and implementation of forestry policy.</li> <li>• Changes in forest management to reflect a greater interest in economic objectives (i.e. profitability) amongst private forest owners and state forest enterprises.</li> <li>• Changes in the market framework towards prices determined by local and international markets and output decisions based on the dynamics of supply and demand.</li> <li>• Transition to market economies has also generally led to increased integration of these economies into the global economy (i.e. increased foreign trade and investment) and greater public awareness and influence on activities in the sector.</li> </ul>

The purpose of future FAO Forestry Department and UNECE Timber Section activities will be to assist the countries in the region to continue to develop their forest sectors, in light of the challenges and opportunities that are presented by the transition process. In this respect, it will draw on the experiences already gained by the countries that have made most progress with the transition process (e.g. the new EU members). In addition, it will also take into account the outlook for the forest sector in these countries. More generally, the strategy will build on the main strengths of FAO and UNECE, which are supporting information collection and analysis and technical expertise in the fields of forest management and forestry policy analysis.

## **2.2 Trends and outlook for the forest sector in Eastern Europe and CIS countries in Europe**

The trends and outlook for the forest sector in Eastern Europe (including new EU members) and CIS countries in Europe have recently been analysed by the FAO and UNECE. These were published as part of the European Forest Sector Outlook Study (EFSOS)<sup>3</sup>. Some of the main results of this analysis are presented here below.

<sup>3</sup> The detailed outlook projections are not presented here. For further details, see: UN, in press, European forest

**Forest products markets.** Forest products markets contracted sharply during the early-1990s, in line with the general decline in economic activities in all of these countries. Since then, the forest sector has expanded rapidly in many countries (i.e. most new EU members and, more recently, in the Russian Federation). This rapid expansion is expected to continue during the coming years across the whole of the region.

In the future, high rates of growth in production and consumption are projected for all of the main forest product categories (although, in general, production is expected to expand more rapidly than consumption). This expansion will be driven by the significant economic potential of the forest sector in these countries (e.g. good access to international forest products markets, significant forest resources and cheap skilled labour). These competitive advantages have led (and will continue to lead) to increased investment in the forest products processing in some countries in Eastern Europe, which will reinforce the expansion of international trade and changes in trade flows.

Specifically with respect to South East Europe and CIS countries in Europe, investment and market developments have lagged behind developments in the new EU members, except in the Russian Federation. Despite this, the EFSOS suggests that production and consumption in these countries will expand rapidly in the future, so long as countries continue with the process of transition (i.e. policy and market reforms).

**Forest resources.** Over the last few decades, the ratio of removals to increment has fallen in most of Eastern Europe and, in particular, in the CIS countries in Europe (e.g. Russian Federation). However, in some countries, increases in harvesting levels since the mid-1990s have pushed the ratio up again (e.g. in the Baltic States). In the future, some countries may start to approach the limits of production growth determined by the availability of forest resources, but others (in particular, the Russian Federation) have the potential to continue growing rapidly for some time to come.

With respect to forest management, privatisation (or restitution) in many countries has resulted in the emergence of a large number of small-scale forest owners, who often lack the skills and resources to manage their forests sustainably. Furthermore, this is often compounded by the small size of the holdings, which limits the potential to achieve economies of scale in forest management. Currently, the generally low wood prices in the region are very competitive, but it is questionable whether they are sufficient to cover some of the future costs of forest management that might arise as these countries become wealthier. This problem has mostly affected the new EU members, but it highlights the challenges that other countries in the region will face as they proceed with the transition process.

The combination of rapid growth in the forest processing sector and the challenges faced by private forest owners suggests that some of the social and environmental benefits of forests in the region could be threatened in the future. For example, although the quality of forest management appears to have remained high, problems such as forest fires, forests pests and diseases and illegal logging may be on the increase. It will remain important for policymakers to identify and assess these problems and to develop appropriate strategies to deal with them in the future.

**Policies and institutions.** In some countries, forest administrations have redefined their roles to accommodate the social, political and economic changes that have accompanied the transition

process. However, in much of South East Europe and the CIS countries in Europe, there is still a great need for policy changes and institutional reform. Frequently, state owned forests are managed through public budgets. The increasing role of the private sector, community groups and civil society organizations are providing new opportunities for the provision of forest products and environmental services. In some cases, especially in CIS countries, this will require substantially reinventing existing institutions. In countries where all forest lands are controlled by the state (State Forest Funds), forest tenure will remain a major issue to be addressed.

The outlook also suggests that the forest sector will face a number of economic challenges in the future (described above), particularly increased demands for social and environmental services from forest management, requiring specific public support. It also stresses the need for improved co-ordination of various policies and institutions dealing with forest management. These challenges will require thoughtful policy analysis and policy reforms across all countries in the region.

### **3. Scope for FAO and UNECE activities**

Any future work in Eastern Europe and Central Asia should focus on a small number of high impact areas in which FAO and UNECE have core competencies. In addition, it should contribute to the broader aims and objectives of the two organisations. It should also avoid duplicating or overlapping with the efforts of other organisations in these countries and, where possible, complement or collaborate with existing initiatives.

#### **3.1. Core activities of FAO**

FAO's main activities are focused in the following four main areas:

- **Putting information within reach.** FAO serves as a knowledge network, specialising in the collection, analysis and dissemination of information about agriculture, fisheries and forestry. This work is implemented with countries through networks of national correspondents and experts.
- **Sharing policy expertise.** FAO has accumulated many years of experience in policy analysis, which is used to assist member countries to design and implement policies and strategies. FAO also provides a venue for countries to share experience amongst themselves at workshops and seminars.
- **Providing a meeting place for nations.** FAO provides a neutral setting where nations can come together to forge agreements on major issues related to agriculture, fisheries and forestry.
- **Bringing knowledge to the field.** FAO mobilizes resources and manages field projects on behalf of industrialised countries, development banks and others. FAO also provides technical expertise for projects and, in a few cases, small amounts of funding for projects.

With respect to forest management in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the main strengths of FAO are its neutrality and objectivity, the vast amount of information held by FAO and its ability to provide a meeting place for nations (especially involving governments and other stakeholders in the sector). Other strengths include the ability to provide a regional and global perspective and to share the experience from a range of situations. Limited financial and human resources (e.g. for

field projects) is a weakness, which implies that FAO should focus on high priority areas and collaboration with others <sup>4</sup>.

### **3.2. Integrated programme of work on forests and timber of FAO and UNECE**

For many countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the work of FAO5 is co-ordinated with the UNECE and implemented jointly with the Joint Secretariat in Geneva. The integrated programme of work on forests and timber of the FAO European Forestry Commission and UNECE Timber Committee, which guides the joint work in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, comprises the following five “work areas”:

1. Markets and statistics;
2. Forest resource assessment and indicators of sustainable forest management;
3. Sector outlook studies - analysis and follow-up;
4. Social and cultural aspects of forestry; and
5. Policy and cross-sectoral issues.

Activities in Eastern Europe and Central Asia are specifically mentioned under work area 1 (capacity building for forest products marketing in countries of CIS and South East Europe) and work area 5 (trends in policies and institutions for the sector in CIS and South East Europe). This strategy should encompass these activities, which have already been identified as a priority by countries in the region.

## **4. Priority areas for future activities**

Based on the assessment of the current status and outlook for the forest sector in the region, the following priority areas for future FAO Forestry Department and UNECE Timber Section activities have been identified:

### **4.1. Forest Management and Marketing**

In countries with significant forest resources, skills and access to markets, there are opportunities for the sector to make a major contribution to economic growth (as has already happened in some new EU members). However, the EFSOS analysis shows that such rapid growth can also threaten the long-term economic viability of forest management. Currently, this threat is felt mostly in Western Europe, where competition from the East is driving down prices and reducing forest owners' incomes. However, these concerns have already been expressed by some new EU members and the problem is likely to extend to South East Europe and CIS countries in Europe.

Where restitution respectively privatization takes places, the forest management is often an issue as frequently the size of forests per owner is very small. In general skills and experiences in modern silviculture are lacking.

Future activities should identify the locations and sub-sectors where countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia have a comparative advantage and examine how the economic viability of forest management can be maintained and improved, including the development of payments for environmental services and improved forest products marketing.

---

<sup>4</sup> FAO, 2004, Meeting on the forestry programme for Central and Eastern European countries, 28-29 June 2004, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Budapest.

<sup>5</sup> FAO operates for this region out of Rome, Budapest and Ankara

FAO and UNECE should emphasise their comparative advantage in capacity building for implementation of best practices guidelines for forest management.

## **4.2 Policy and institutional framework**

There have been profound and rapid changes in forest sector policies and institutions in many of the advanced reform countries in Eastern Europe (e.g. the new EU members). This has supported the transition process and has increased the ability of forest administrations to cope with future challenges, particularly with the development of healthy forests, which are able to provide needed products and services in a sustainable way. Due to increasing environmental awareness and multifunctionality of forests the forest management policy framework has evolved in various directions and established a variety of specific institutions, dealing with forest management directly, whereas coordination of these policies is underdeveloped.

However, many other countries in the region are only just starting to consider policy and institutional reform. These latter countries could benefit from the experiences accumulated up to now and FAO and UNECE should support activities to share these experiences.

Cross-sectoral linkages have been identified as important in the EFSOS and at the Regional Forestry Congress. Forest sector stakeholders should intensify the policy dialogue, by drawing the attention of other policy areas (such as agriculture, trade, environment and energy) to the social and environmental benefits of sustainable forest management and the contribution that the sector can make to overall sustainable development. FAO and ECE can assist this through their contacts with others outside the sector and their ability to work across sectors.

In Central and Eastern Europe the forest sector is going through major tenure reforms including privatization and restitution. These tenure changes have generated a number of challenges due to the fragmentation of forest holdings and the changing roles of the forest administrations. In CIS countries where the State controls the “forest funds”, tenure arrangements involving different stakeholders are being developed and tested. FAO is conducting a series of regional studies on forest tenure and its impact on sustainable forest management and sustainable livelihoods. FAO is also facilitating networking and exchange of experience on this important topic in Europe and Central Asia.

Forest law enforcement and governance has recently been identified as a topic requiring further investigation. Governments should ensure that acceptable standards of forest law enforcement and governance are achieved, particularly if they wish to trade with other nations where this is a concern for consumers. This is an issue of concern in some countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Technical assistance in this area is therefore a high priority for the FAO Forestry Department.

## **4.3 Capacity building**

For some countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, formal employment in the forest sector is significant and the EFSOS analysis has suggested that issues such as training, health and safety may require closer scrutiny at the national and local level. In CIS countries, excluding the Russian Federation, most of their forestry training institutions were lost and capacities in these countries are rapidly disappearing, thus creating an urgent need to alleviate this situation. For other countries, the social contribution of the sector is more likely to be focused on informal

activities that support the poorest members of society. Technical assistance in both of these areas should be a high priority for FAO, ILO and UNECE activities in the future.

#### **4.4 Forest Protection**

Many of the threats to environmental sustainability are specific to a few individual countries or have occurred due to short-term shocks to the sector. For example, poverty, civil disturbance or war and weak institutions have resulted in problems such as: excessive forest fires; overharvesting (notably for woodfuel); overgrazing; illegal logging; soil erosion; deforestation; forest degradation and even desertification. Other threats to forest health are forests pests and diseases, which due to their often transboundary nature require coordinated and collaborative responses. The management of forests contaminated by radioactivity (e.g. as a result of the Chernobyl catastrophe) poses a particular challenge. FAO and UNECE activities to support government attempts to control these problems should be developed on an *ad-hoc* basis as and when a concrete need arises. Also FAO and UNECE should continue to assist on forest fire prevention through long-term monitoring, early warning, prevention, preparedness, suppression and restoration as well as strengthen international co-operation in this area and to provide technical guidance about the development of national strategies for forest fire prevention and control.

Outbreaks of indigenous insect pests are occurring in several countries possibly related to climatic influences. Recently, diebacks and declines are reported in the Russian Federation affecting nearly one million hectares of boreal coniferous forests and Kyrgyzstan is reporting pest problems in their relict walnut and pistachio forests. Adequate measures need to be taken to establish efficient monitoring and prediction systems. With the increased threat of invasive species (insects, diseases and woody invasive) which may threaten biodiversity, attention should be given to strengthening country capacity to meet their commitments under the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

#### **4.5 Forest information management and communication**

As noted above, information about the forest sector is not readily available at the international level in many countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Improving access to this information should be a major priority, as without it, neither the countries themselves nor the international community can assess the situation and set priorities. There are already existing mechanisms and experienced networks supported by FAO and UNECE for the collection, validation, analysis and exchange of information at the regional level. Once countries are brought into these networks, this should help them to maintain contact with other parts of the international community.

It is important that country capacity to undertake national forest assessments be strengthened to provide relevant, current and consistent forest related data (forest, social, environmental and economic parameters) for policy dialogue, planning and reporting in South Eastern Europe and the CIS countries in Europe.

More generally, there are also few reliable quantitative and policy relevant data on the environmental and social benefits of forests available to policy makers. A number of countries in CIS and South East Europe have stressed the importance of such information, so improvements should be made in this area.

## 5. Approach and working methods

### 5.1. Sub-regional priorities

It is clear that different sub-regions within Eastern Europe and Central Asia vary greatly in terms of the challenges that they face and their capacities within the sector. Furthermore, other agencies and existing partnerships are already addressing some of these issues in different parts of the region. Therefore, for this strategy, countries in the region have been divided as follows:

- **South East Europe:** Albania; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Bulgaria; Croatia; Romania; Serbia; Montenegro; and TFYR of Macedonia.
- **Eastern Europe:** Belarus; Republic of Moldova; Russian Federation and Ukraine.
- **Caucasus:** Armenia; Georgia; Republic of Azerbaijan
- **Central Asia:** Kazakhstan; Kyrgyzstan; Tajikistan; Turkmenistan; and Uzbekistan.

It should also be noted that the new EU members should be invited to actively participate in many of the activities proposed under this strategy. Their need for assistance is much lower than in the countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, but they have a huge amount of valuable experience that they can share with the other countries and their participation is clearly within the mandate of FAO and UNECE to promote international co-operation.

### 5.2. Working methods

The following are some of the main activities that will be supported by FAO and UNECE:

- **Information collection and analysis.** Regular and *ad-hoc* surveys of the sector on particular topics where information is not readily available. Production of national, thematic and synthesis reports on topics of high importance to decision makers. These activities are likely to account for a major share of future activities in the region. Crucial to the success of these efforts will be detailed and comprehensive guidance and support from FAO and UNECE technical staff.
- **Sharing of Experience.** Organisation of seminars and workshops to share experiences and, where appropriate, develop international co-operation in specific subject areas. Meetings are also important to establish contacts and build the capacity of national correspondents so that they can regularly reply to international requests for information (notably on Forest Resource Assessment, Timber Statistics, Forest Tenure as well as Policies and Institutions. This is also likely to be a major focus of future activities.
- **Collaboration.** Collaboration between countries and with partner organisations will be essential to mobilise resources and maximise the impact of activities. Teams of specialists and networks of experts will continue to play an important role in the implementation of FAO and UNECE activities.
- **Field projects.** FAO field project resources are scarce and UNECE have no such resources. Thus, proposals for field projects must be focused on countries where the needs are high and alternative sources of support are limited. Furthermore, projects are likely to be of a short-term nature to meet unforeseen needs. Field projects are unlikely to account for a major share of future activities. However, FAO and UNECE will actively pursue

opportunities to provide technical assistance to projects (in the priority areas listed above) that are funded from national and other international sources.

- **Training.** Small amounts for training and study tours may be provided as and when required, but this is likely to account for a very small share of future activities. Training should include both FAO-UNECE sponsored events and opportunities for short-term placements within the two organisations (e.g. under the FAO Academic and Volunteers Programmes).

### **5.3. Infrastructure**

The current document is a subject of advice provided by the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists on “Contribution of Forest Management to Sustainable Development” as well as follow-up approval by the EFC/TC bureaux. It presents the framework for implementation measures planned and carried out by UNECE and FAO offices (HQ and sub-regional), with support of the UNECE/FAO Team of Specialists in this field. The EFC/TC bureaux will review annually the implementation of this strategy.

In order to avoid any double work respectively shortages, considering the scope of the strategy a rolling two-year work plan is established to describe, collect, monitor, coordinate and analyze the various outcomes that countries wish to achieve and the activities that FAO and UNECE (Rome, Geneva, Budapest and Ankara) will implement in support of these outcomes.

### **5.4. Resource mobilisation**

The majority of resources available for the implementation of this strategy will come from the existing FAO and UNECE Regular Programmes, with small amounts of funding from the FAO Technical Co-operation Programme (TCP) where possible. It is extremely unlikely that these resources will increase in the future, so activities should continue to aim to maximise value-for money and complementarity with existing projects and the initiatives of others. In particular, it also seems likely that activities will continue to rely on significant inputs from national authorities.

FAO and UNECE have had some success in attracting additional funding from other agencies and will continue to explore the opportunities for co-funding and pooling resources. To date, most extra-budgetary funding has been obtained in an opportunistic way rather than in a systematic manner (e.g. when countries have come to FAO or UNECE and offered to support an activity). In the future, a more systematic approach to resource mobilisation will be attempted and the Team of Specialists is expected to play a major role in this respect.

### **5.5. Partnerships and synergies**

There are a few major institutions already working on forestry issues with countries in the region, most notably the European Commission and World Bank. FAO and UNECE will ensure that the implementation of this strategy does not overlap with these efforts, but will focus on the priority areas above in the countries that need most support. Furthermore, as noted above, FAO and UNECE will actively pursue opportunities to work together with these agencies on projects of mutual interest.

In addition to this, FAO and UNECE will continue to work closely with other major stakeholders in the region (Members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, EC, MCPFE, industry associations, other international organisations and non-governmental organisations) and will continue to support and encourage national authorities that wish to work in partnership on these topics.

## Summary

The table below summarises the main elements and expected outcomes of the strategy. The summary is deliberately very general, indicating the broad topics and main partners that will be involved in the implementation of the strategy. More focused and detailed proposals for activities will be developed with the assistance of the Team of Specialists at regular intervals.

<b>Programme element and</b> ▪ Expected outcomes	<b>External partners</b>
<b>A. Strengthened forest management and marketing</b>	
A.1. Management and marketing of goods and services from private forests improved	CEPF ELO, Joint Network
A.2. Management and marketing of goods and services from state forest enterprises improved	EUSTAFOR joint Network
A.3. Contribution of forest products and social and environmental forest services to income and employment increased	ILO
A.4. Forest health and forest protection (including fire management) promoted	MCPFE, IUCN, Joint Network, JRC of EU, Global Fire Monitoring Center, UNISDR Regional Wildland Fire Networks, International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
A.5 Forest protection, rehabilitation and afforestation	IUCN, WWF
<b>B. Strengthened policy and institutional framework of the forest sector</b>	
B.1. Forest governance including law compliance strengthened	ENAFLEG, EU-FLEGT, ITTO
B.2. Coordination and integration of forest - related policies improved	MCPFE
B.3 Integration of forestry with other sectors, e.g. energy or rural development, through cross-sectorial approaches increased	.IUCN, UNEP, MCPFE
B.4. More participation in forest policy decision making achieved	
B.5. Public and private forest institutions and associations strengthened	CEPF, EUSTAFOR
B.6 Investment climate for the forest sector improved.	WB, Transparency Intern., Bertelsmann
<b>C. Improved forest information management and communication</b>	
C.1. Monitoring, assessment and reporting of data and information on forest resources, products, policies and institutions improved	MCPFE, ICP Forest, IUFRO, CEI
C.2. National and international forest policy and information processes and networks strengthened	IUFRO, Statistics WP
C.3. International assistance to forest sector monitored and synergies sought	EC, WB, GEF
C.4. Public awareness on contribution of forest sector to sustainable development increased	IUCN, UNEP, CEPF, MCPFE, FCN

Proposed revised terms of Reference for the Team of Specialists

<p>FAO/UNECE Team of Specialists on</p> <p><b>Contribution of Forests to Sustainable Development in Eastern Europe*</b></p> <p><i>Reference to Integrated Work Program:</i>  <b>Work Area 5, Program element 5.3; and</b>  <b>Work Area 1: Program element 1.3</b></p>	
<b>A. OBJECTIVES</b>	
<p>Enhance effectiveness of international activities intended to support and contribute to sustainable development of the forest sector in South East Europe and in CIS, notably through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strengthened forest management and marketing</b></li> <li>• <b>Strengthened policy and institutional framework</b></li> <li>• <b>Improved forest information management and communication</b></li> </ul>	
<p>EXPECTED MAJOR OUTPUTS:</p> <p>The team will identify priority issues in South East Europe and CIS and will promote a transparent regional discussion of priorities and best practice in reforming policies and institutions in the sector. It will be consulted on the formulation of a strategy for FAO activities for the forest sector of countries in transition. It will advise the UNECE and FAO team<sup>6</sup>, on the implementation of their programs within the framework of the integrated program of work. Major expected outputs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assistance in the formulation of appropriate activities;</li> <li>• Feedback on the effectiveness of the various initiatives;</li> <li>• Assistance in resource mobilization in support of the various activities;</li> <li>• Contributions to the sharing of knowledge and information.</li> </ul>	
<b>B. BACKGROUND</b>	
<b>ESTABLISHED / APPROVED BY</b>	Joint Session of the UNECE Timber Committee and FAO European Forestry Commission, Geneva, October 2004
<b>DURATION</b>	From 2005 to 2008
<b>METHODS OF WORK</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings and recommendations to the secretariats,</li> <li>• Intensive communication among the members</li> <li>• Partnerships will be established with relevant governmental and non-governmental organizations, notably MCPFE.</li> </ul>
<b>REPORTING</b>	Once a year: to the Joint Bureaux Meeting of UNECE Timber Committee and FAO European Forestry Commission
<b>TEAM LEADER</b>	Team Leader: Ms. Gulusa Vildanova, Uzbekistan Vice-Leader / Technical assistant (through next meeting): Mr. Vlatko Andonovski, TFYR of Macedonia
<p><b>*Includes Eastern European and Central Asian countries:</b> Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan Republic of, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia TFYR of, Moldova Republic of, Mongolia (?), Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan</p>	

<sup>6</sup> Staff working out of Budapest, Geneva and Rome, and possibly Ankara

<p><b>TEAM MEMBERS</b></p>	<p><u>Country representatives (sorted by country)</u>  Mr. Samvel Saakyan (Armenia)  Mr. Bahadır Vekilov (Azerbaijan, Republic of)  Mr. Valery Pobirusko (Belarus)  Mr. Marko Šašek (Croatia)  Mr. Antonis Horattas (Cyprus)  Mr. Ivan Paligorov (Bulgaria)  Mr. Miroslav Kravka (Czech Republic)  Mr. Vit Obrdlik (Czech Republic)  Mr. Jan Ilavsky (Finland)  Mr. Paata Torchinava (Georgia)  Mr. Jobst-Michael Schroeder (Germany)  Mr. Tamás Lapos (Hungary)  Mr. Kairat Ustemirov (Kazakhstan)  Ms. Chinara Yakupova (Kyrgyzstan)  Ms. Ilze Silamikele (Latvia)  Mr. Vlatko Andonovski (Macedonia, TFYR of)  Mr. Wouter Leen Hijweege (Netherlands)  Mr. Øystein Aasaaren (Norway)  Mr. Adam Kaliszewski (Poland)  Mr. Anatoly Petrov (Russian Federation)  Mr. Aleksander Radosavljevic (Serbia and Montenegro)  Mr. Julius Novotny (Slovakia)  Mr. Bert-Åke Näslund (Sweden)  Mr. Nurali Rahimov (Tajikistan)  Mr. Mustafa Kurtulmuslu (Turkey)  Ms. Lyubov Polyakova (Ukraine)  Ms. Gulusa Vildanova (Uzbekistan)</p> <p><u>Other participating partners (sorted by last name)</u>  Mr. Piotr Borkowski (MCPFE)  Mr. Gerben Janse (EFI)  Mr. Attila Lengyel (CEPF)  Mr. Tamas Marghescu (IUCN)  Mr. Sten Nilsson (IIASA)</p>
<p><b>RESPONSIBLE SECRETARIAT MEMBER</b></p>	<p>Mr. Volker Sasse, FAO/SEUR, Budapest  Mr. Dominique Reeb, FAO/SEC, Ankara</p>