

## 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee on Forestry

### Written Correspondence Procedure – inputs from Members (English version)

#### Item 8.3 Dialogue with Statutory Bodies in Forestry

Member Name	Comments
Australia (25 September)	<p><u>Regional Forestry Commissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australia wishes to reflect on a matter that was raised by the 28<sup>th</sup> Session of the Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission (APFC) pertaining to the Asia-Pacific Forestry Sector Outlook Study, and its relationship to a recent recommendation of the Programme Committee.</li> <li>• In line with the Evaluation of FAO's Statistical Work (PC 128/5) and recommendations by the Programme Committee in its 128<sup>th</sup> Session, we suggest ensuring that forest sector outlooks are based on strengthened statistical work in order to provide contextually relevant recommendations. Australia welcomes the development of the Asia-Pacific Forest Sector Outlook Study and supports the recommendation by the APFC at 11f to fill gaps in the study and strengthen the statistical basis on which the Forest Sector Outlook is undertaken.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rules of Procedure for the Working Group on Dryland Forests and Agrosilvopastoral Systems</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australia suggest that Rules of Procedure language presented for the Working Group on Dryland Forests and Agrosilvopastoral Systems, and other such administrative documents, should be gender neutral.</li> <li>• We propose that the Rule I, Paragraph 4 should read:  <i>The Chairperson, or in <u>their</u> absence one of the Vice-Chairpersons, shall preside...</i></li> </ul> <p><u>International Poplar Commission</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australia thanks the Committee for the update on the International Poplar Commission (IPC) and notes its newly broadened focus. We also note the proposed recommendation to take concrete actions through fast-growing species to support the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration.</li> <li>• We would be grateful for additional guidance on this proposal, particularly around ecological considerations such as the role of slower growing endemic species, the definition of successful ecosystem restoration, and how this aligns with the intent of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration.</li> </ul>

Japan (25 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the adaptation of the amended convention, the scope of the International Commission Poplars and Other Fast-Growing Trees Sustaining People and the Environment (IPC) was expanded to all fast-growing trees that sustain people and the environment from poplars and willows. On the other hand, the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) promotes the sustainable management and conservation of tropical forests and the expansion and diversification of international trade in tropical timber from sustainably managed and legally harvested forests including fast-growing trees. Therefore, Japan believes that it is important to have coordination and cooperation between IPC and ITTO to avoid overlap or duplication of works and make steps forward.</li> </ul>
USA (25 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The North American Forestry Commission (NAFC) has fostered a long standing and fruitful partnership between Canada, Mexico, and the United States on forestry issues. In practice, NAFC chooses to focus on collaborative research and field activities of shared interest, rather than operate solely as policy dialogue forum. While policies/policy approaches are discussed, there is no overall aim to seek coherence or harmonization between our policies as a region, but rather learn from each other's experiences and to pursue collaborative field/research activities of common interest.</li> <li>While recognizing the importance of synergies between the Regional Forestry Commissions (RFCs), COFO, and FAO and the need to inform each other's work, it is important to respect the RFCs prerogative to set their own aims, priorities, and modalities of collaboration amongst their members, and not to enforce a top down approach from COFO/FAO on the RFCs.</li> <li>As written, bullet three "under points of consideration" on this issue solely casts the work and aim of the RFCs through the lens of the SDGs, the Paris Agreement, and the Global Forest Goals. The original aim of the Regional Forestry Commissions was to bring together the heads of forestry to address the most pressing issues <u>in that region</u>, and existed well before those initiatives and agreements. Moreover, some countries may not be party to all those agreements.</li> <li>We, therefore, request that the text of the COFO report and recommendations under this agenda item reflect this flexibility and that if the third bullet point under recommended actions is to be included in the COFO report, the text be amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"The Committee requests FAO to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Review and consult with Members on further improving</del> Consult with Regional Forestry Commissions on ways FAO can help facilitate as a well-established mechanisms for their policy dialogue and technical exchanges to assist them in achieving their members' goals and contributions to international processes and goals. <del>-, with a view to further strengthening collaboration and collaborative action across sectors and stakeholders to achieve the SDGs, the Paris Agreement, and the Global Forest Goals.</del></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In regards to the ACSFI, we recognize and note the important work accomplished in the past two years under this body.</li> <li>• However, the key messages of ACSFI are not negotiated outcomes of COFO member states, and contain language that may not be reflected in the policies of individual member states or terminology with no common definitional agreement. Therefore, the US cannot endorse the key messages. Instead we request that the recommendation from COFO be adjusted to read that COFO “acknowledges” the ACSFI outputs and key messages arising out of its 60<sup>th</sup> and 61<sup>st</sup> sessions.</li> <li>• It is also not clear why the recommendation directing FAO to finalize the ACSFI Strategic Framework is needed or appropriate. The COFO does not direct nor approve the work of ACSFI or its Strategic Framework. It is a separate statutory body. We recommend that this bullet point be deleted and not included in the COFO final report.</li> </ul>
Russian Federation (25 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annex I, paragraphs 4 and 5: We would like to request more detailed information on the aims and methods of strengthening the strategic role of FAO’s Regional Forestry Commissions.</li> </ul>
Indonesia (26 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia welcomes and appreciate the preparation of Document COFO/2020/8.3/Rev.1 on the Dialogue with Statutory Bodies in Forestry as a comprehensive yet concise document.</li> <li>• On the relation with the RFCs, Indonesia proposes that it be in both top-down as suggested in Points for Consideration 4.a, but also bottom up by adding “... Regional bodies, and inviting ideas and inputs on such issues.” This is indeed already the common practice now.</li> <li>• Regarding the Advisory Committee on Sustainable Forest-based Industries (ACFSI), Indonesia appreciates the committee in welcoming Dr Indroyono Soesilo, the Chairman of Association of Indonesian Forest Concessionaires (APHI), as the new member of the committee, in its 60<sup>th</sup> session, held in Vancouver, Canada on 7 May 2019.</li> <li>• We also feel that the work of ASCFI needs to be shared with the Committee on Forestry, and so we suggest additional point for consideration which reads “Encourage ACSFI with the support of the Secretariat to organize events during COFO Sessions to share and consult on its works.”</li> </ul>
Argentina (26 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Argentina actively participated in the 31<sup>st</sup> Session of the Latin American and Caribbean Forestry Commission (LACFC), which was held in Montevideo, Uruguay from 2 to 6 September 2019. The recommendations that came out of the meeting served as a major input to document FO:COFO/2020/9.5 on FAO’s work in forestry under the reviewed Strategic Framework.</li> <li>• We appreciate the main messages conveyed during the 61<sup>st</sup> Session of the Advisory Committee on Sustainable Forest-based Industries (ACSFI), which is the main FAO Statutory Body working with the private sector. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Nevertheless, Argentina understands the need for the ACSFI assessment to highlight the promotion of sustainable wood value chains with particular emphasis on developing countries. Therefore, we suggest amending the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet of paragraph 11 as follows (addition in bold):</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p><i>“Invite ACSFI to continue catalyzing strategic partnerships between FAO and the private sector to support country efforts to achieve the SDGs, <b>in particular in developing countries</b>”.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ With regard to the International Commission on Poplars and Other Fast-Growing Trees Sustaining People and the Environment (IPC), we note the amendments to its Convention that include expansion of the original IPC scope to all fast-growing trees that sustain people and the environment, from a prior exclusive remit in the poplars and willows. Argentina supports and promotes this reform and encourages the Executive Committee and FAO to continue its work, making the IPC an effective instrument in light of the expansion of the IPC’s scope.</li> <li>○ With regard to the Working Group on Dryland Forests and Agrosilvopastoral Systems, we encourage and promote measures to strengthen its work due to the importance of agrosilvopastoral systems for sustainable production.</li> </ul>
Turkey (27 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process should be discussed about where and when the 7th Mediterranean Forests Week, which was planned to be held in Tunisia but was canceled due to the withdrawal of Tunisia. The document also mentions the training center in partnership with Mountain, and this training center can be made available to the experts of the mountain partnership online and, if possible, free of charge.</li> </ul>
European Union (28 September)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am honoured to speak on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States.</li> <li>• We welcome the information provided in document COFO/2020/8.3 and the valuable work presented by the various statutory bodies in forestry. We invite FAO to explore further options for even better linking the work of these groups to the work of the Forestry Division and other policy areas with relevance for forestry, in order to increase their relevance and efficiency and to create synergies and enhance participation.</li> <li>• Notably, we welcome with appreciation the work of the newly established Working Group on Dryland Forests and Agro-silvo-pastoral Systems and approve the revised rules of procedure as presented.</li> <li>• We wish to stress the importance to give FAO forestry regional bodies and regional stakeholders a more policy-relevant role at the FAO regional conferences in order to gain the full wealth of available information at local and regional level for the work on forestry.</li> <li>• We underline the special role of the private sector in forestry and invite therefore FAO to support this sector especially in capacity building for sustainable production, consumption and trade in forest products. The new FAO strategy on private sector partnerships should take this into account.</li> </ul>

Peru (28 September)	<p><b><u>AFWC/EFC/NEFC Committee on Mediterranean Forestry Questions "Silva Mediterranea"</u></b></p> <p><b>1. <u>Paragraph 2</u></b>  On the initiative for the restoration of degraded lands, under the project entitled “The Paris Agreement in action: upscaling forest and landscape restoration to achieve nationally determined contributions”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ¿Will reforestation and agroforestry with small, medium and large producers be considered in the restoration activities?</li> <li>• ¿Will the legal condition of land occupation be taken into account for the implementation of activities?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>The International Commission on Poplars and Other Fast-Growing Trees Sustaining People and the Environment (IPC)</u></b></p> <p><b>1. <u>Paragraph 2</u></b>  • Fostering the sustainable development of fast-growing trees all over the world. Will the legal condition of land occupation be taken into account in areas where the fostering takes place? And, which activities will be implemented? Is there likely to be a fostering of native and/or non-native species?</p> <p><b><u>WORKING GROUP ON DRYLAND FORESTS AND AGROSILVOPASTORAL SYSTEMS</u></b></p> <p><b>1. <u>Paragraph 5</u></b>  In collecting the information for the Global Dryland Assessment with a view to better prioritizing investment needed for dryland restoration and management; ¿was information on the legal condition of land occupation considered and assessed?</p>
Mexico (1 October)	<p><b><u>Comments:</u></b>  Mexico supports the recommendations made in document COFO/2020/8.3 to the Committee on Forestry.</p>